

The Historical Outlook

A JOURNAL FOR

READERS, STUDENTS AND TEACHERS OF HISTORY

Continuing The History Teacher's Magazine

BOARD OF EDITORS APPOINTED BY THE AMERICAN HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION:

EDGAR DAWSON, L. M. LARSON, LUCY M. SALMON, ST. G. L. SIOUSSAT, W. L. WESTERMANN

ALBERT E. MCKINLEY, MANAGING EDITOR

Volume XI.
Number 5.

PHILADELPHIA, MAY, 1920.

\$2.00 a year.
25 cents a copy.

CONTENTS

PAGE

Experiences of a Y. M. C. A. Secretary in Russia, by T. P. Martin - - - - -	169
John Dickinson, Statesman and Patriot, by Prof. D. C. Shilling	174
The Personality of Robespierre, Source Study for College Classes, by Prof. H. E. Bourne - - - - -	177
The Socialized Recitation, by Bessie L. Pierce - - - - -	189
Recent Tendencies in the Social Studies, by Dr. D. C. Knowlton,	194
Methods of Checking Collateral Reading, by A. S. Barr - - - - -	195
Department of Social Studies - - - - -	197
Papers by Prof. D. Snedden, J. C. Peters, and others.	

Periodical Literature, by Dr. G. B. Richards, 202; Notes from the Historical Field, 202 (New England Association, Rhode Island History Teachers, N. E. A. Committee on Social Studies); Book Reviews, edited by Prof. W. J. Chase, 204; Current Articles on Teaching of History, listed by W. L. Hall, 205; Current Historical Articles, listed by L. F. Stock, 205; Recent Historical Publications, listed by Dr. C. A. Coulomb, 206.

Published monthly, except July, August and September, by McKinley Publishing Co., Philadelphia, Pa.

Copyrighted, 1920 McKinley Publishing Co. Entered as second-class matter, October 26, 1909, at Post-office at Phila., Pa., under Act of March 3, 1879

CAUSES

their emphasis, rather than the mere tabulation of events, especially distinguish

AMERICAN HISTORY

(Revised Edition)

By David Saville Muzzey

Readableness, clearness, the omission of unimportant detail and the "sources" system of gathering information from contemporary evidence—qualities which made this the most widely used textbook in its subject—have been carefully kept in the new edition. New matter, new maps, new illustrations have been added to bring it to the fall of 1919.

GINN AND COMPANY

70 FIFTH AVENUE

NEW YORK

PATRIOTISM vs. BOLSHEVISM

IGNORANCE of our past history, lack of high ideals, unbridled criticism of our government, and the idea that liberty means license, may lead to far-reaching and serious evils.

To keep these Bolshevistic ideas from taking root in the minds of young people, it is necessary to implant an intelligent and enduring patriotism, and for this, the right kind of instruction in history is necessary.

HART'S SCHOOL HISTORY OF THE UNITED STATES is unusual in its strong and impressive patriotic influence. Boys and girls like this book; it is clear, vivid, impressive—above all, interesting. *Ideal for junior high schools.*

AMERICAN BOOK COMPANY

New York

Cincinnati

Chicago

Boston

Atlanta

Effective History Maps

that really enable you to get the maximum results in history teaching and study—

No question about it—you want maps of that character. Then you will not delay to inquire about the Johnston-Nystrom Series mentioned below:

AMERICAN HISTORY

By PROF. A. H. SANFORD, State Normal School, La Crosse, Wisconsin. 66 maps on 32 large plates, each 38x48 in.

EUROPEAN HISTORY—Mediaeval and Modern

W. & A. K. Johnston's Series of 25 wall maps, size 40x30 in. Includes a new map, showing racial distribution in Europe.

ANCIENT HISTORY

W. & A. K. Johnston's Series of six extra large maps, size 52x44 in.

ENGLISH HISTORY

W. & A. K. Johnston's Series of 10 wall maps, size 30x40 in.

Get full particulars to-day. Clip this ad—checking the series of maps in which you are interested.

A. J. NYSTROM & CO.

2249-53 Calumet Avenue

Chicago, Ill.

University of Wisconsin

Summer Session 1920

June 28 to August 6

Law School, June 28 to September 3

350 Courses. 230 Instructors. Graduate and undergraduate work leading to the bachelor's and higher degrees. *Letters and Science, Medicine, Engineering, Law and Agriculture* (including *Home Economics*).

Chase, Fish, McNeal (of Ohio), Paxson, Roch, and Westermann, will offer lecture and training courses, and graduate seminars.

Favorable Climate

Lakeside Advantages

One fee for all courses, \$20, except Law (10 weeks), \$32

For detailed announcements, address

REGISTRAR, UNIVERSITY

Madison, Wisconsin

Recent American History

The present tendency in the teaching of American history is to place the emphasis upon the economic and social facts and tendencies of the last fifty years. Few textbooks as yet have arranged these facts in clear, analytical fashion. Teachers who desire to make this period significant for their classes should consult the outlines, references, and source-material contained in

McKinley's Illustrated Topics for American History

In these Topics will be found assistance for the study of Recent American History, for courses in American Social and Economic Problems, and for the study of the World War. The Topics contain—in addition to syllabus, references, maps and pictures—a remarkably valuable collection of documents relating to the participation of the United States in the World War.

Samples will be cheerfully sent by

McKINLEY PUBLISHING COMPANY
PHILADELPHIA

NOW READY

Numbers 2 to 16 inclusive of

McKinley's Illustrated Topics for Medieval and Modern History

Prepared by DANIEL C. KNOWLTON, Ph.D.

These topics are superior to anything heretofore issued to aid the teaching and study of European History, from the time of Charlemagne to Louis XIV. They contain a syllabus, references to textbooks and collateral reading, outline maps to be filled in by the pupils, pictures truly illustrative of historic facts, and source-material for reading and problem studies.

PRICE: Two cents for each topic; thirty cents for the fifteen topics. Covers to fit the topics, twenty-five cents.

SAMPLES FREE

Samples of the Medieval and Modern Topics will be sent postpaid to any teacher interested in them. In writing for samples please give school position and address.

For further information, write to

McKINLEY PUBLISHING CO., Philadelphia

CURRENT HISTORY

The problem of teaching current history in schools is complicated by so many difficulties that some teachers advocate avoiding controversial topics altogether. But in these days of loose thinking and radical teaching, is this a safe policy for the schools in a democracy to pursue?

History teachers who are working on this problem will be interested in the following list of selected books, some basal texts and some suited for purposes of supplementary reading, all written with the idea of helping young people to think straight, to cherish American ideals, and to develop a stability of thought and of character that will keep them unaffected by the misleading arguments of revolutionary propagandists.

Ashley's MODERN EUROPEAN CIVILIZATION

How the living past developed into the living present. The story of Europe in recent centuries, with emphasis on industrial and social progress. Half of the book is devoted to the last half century, one-tenth to the World War or conditions leading to the war, and one-fifth to geography, physical and economic, to occupations, to national characteristics and to other features of present-day Europe of special importance in these days of world reconstruction. In proportions, in selection of topics, and in treatment, it is in the front rank of books that present modern European institutions and conditions from the point of view of present-day interests in American schools.

Beard and Bagley's THE HISTORY OF THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

Correct emphasis on the important periods and movements, adequate treatment of present-day problems; a well-balanced chapter on the World War. A history that arranges and presents the record of American achievement fairly and justly, and presents American ideals in a way that safeguards the future of our democracy.

Burch and Patterson's AMERICAN SOCIAL PROBLEMS

A book on the live problems of community and national life, most of which can only be solved by many citizens *becoming active* about them. Written for the high school course by men who are teaching the subject in the West Philadelphia High School for Boys.

Ashley's THE NEW CIVICS

A well-balanced book, sound in its teaching. It gives more than information; it awakens interest and stimulates thought. It is a study of the collective relationships of American citizens and proceeds from the point of view of the "public" or general welfare rather than the personal standpoint of the isolated individual citizen.

Powers' THE AMERICAN ERA

A discussion of America's great opportunity for moral leadership in the present period of world restoration.

Powers' AMERICA AND BRITAIN

An unprejudiced and well-written review of the historical relations of the two leading Anglo-Saxon nations.

Usher's THE GREAT WAR

A vivid chronological account of the World War in style suitable for supplementary reading in schools.

THE MACMILLAN COMPANY

NEW YORK
DALLAS

BOSTON
ATLANTA

CHICAGO
SAN FRANCISCO

The Historical Outlook

Continuing The History Teacher's Magazine

Volume XI.
Number 5.

PHILADELPHIA, MAY, 1920

\$2.00 a year.
25 cents a copy.

Experiences of a Y. M. C. A. Secretary in Russia, 1917-1918

BY THOMAS P. MARTIN.

The "Third Party" of Y. M. C. A. secretaries sent to Russia, of which I was a member, left New York on the 4th of October, 1917, for Petrograd by way of San Francisco, Yokohama, Kioto, Tsuruga, Vladivostok, and the Trans-Siberian Railway. We sailed from San Francisco on the 11th of October, and reached Yokohama about eighteen days later; from Tsuruga we sailed across the Japan Sea on the *Simbirsk*, a vessel of the Russian Volunteer Fleet, and arrived at Vladivostok on the 10th of November. The story of my experiences may best be told by abstracts and quotations from my letters and notes, which follow in chronological order. The material is necessarily limited very largely to social life and economic conditions of a local character, for as Y. M. C. A. secretaries we mingled chiefly with the people commonly met with in cities, towns, and army camps.

It was in Kioto, Japan, on the 5th of November, 1917, that we first heard the news of the Bolshevik *coup d'état* in Petrograd, and there, too, that we first actually met Russian émigrés and had some conversations with them. We made the acquaintance of a wealthy Russian cotton manufacturer, who spoke English fluently and with good pronunciation. He had left Russia, he said, because the peasants and workmen had taken to shooting landlords, manufacturers, and capitalists generally. It was dangerous to be out on the street or even in one's house. No; he did not think the Bolshevik régime would last very long, but who could tell? for the country was becoming so thoroughly disorganized, and the people were so demoralized and sick of the war. Some of the boys went out riding with this Russian manufacturer in a touring car driven by a Japanese chauffeur, and the following incident happened. They came upon a villager pulling a heavily laden cart along the road, and found it necessary to slow down to a stop for a moment until the fellow could get his cart out of the way. It was a bit unfortunate for the villager, for his cartwheels were now in softer soil, and he would have to exert himself harder and lose some time in getting his cart back onto the well-beaten road. The chauffeur drove the car past him, got out and helped him with his cart, bowed politely and thanked him. This was an unusual case, no doubt, but the Russian manufacturer had this to say: "It is remarkable how patient and sweet-tempered and calm these Japanese are. If this had happened in Russia, that fellow would have had

the vilest epithets hurled at him for having been so stupid as not to get out of our way in time. But things have changed!"

Although our leaders at first questioned the advisability of taking the party into Russia in the face of the Bolshevik revolution, it was finally decided that we should proceed.

On the morning of the 6th of November, we ran down to Tsuruga and found that our ship, the *Simbirsk*, on which we were to sail for Vladivostok, was just entering the harbor, a day late. According to stories that were told, the captain had taken offense at some one in the port, "somebody had insulted him," before his last departure, and he had sworn never to enter the port again. Finally, the managers of the company, who were not in a position to "hire and fire" as they pleased, induced him to agree to navigate the vessel on condition that some one else be sent along to transact all necessary business. A whole day passed in Tsuruga before any one knew whether he would permit a cargo to be taken on board, which delay caused us to miss the weekly Petrograd Express.

There arrived on board this vessel a large number of Russian women and children, who were going to the United States—to Cleveland, Chicago, Philadelphia, and New York, where many of them had husbands and fathers, who had sent them money to leave Russia and come to "The States." Other Russians, of the upper classes, and some American business men and factory managers, each with his own story, also landed from the *Simbirsk* and passed on to other ports of Japan. Most of them predicted a severe food and fuel famine during the winter, which would cause the Russian people to repudiate their Bolshevik leaders and turn to the better classes.

After a stormy voyage on the Japan Sea, during which we were introduced to herring, cabbage soup, caviar, and other unsavory dishes, we arrived at Vladivostok on the morning of the 10th of November, 1917, and landed without any particular difficulty. As the ship drew up to the wharf, those of us who were looking for Bolsheviks, thought that we saw them, but instead of Bolsheviks swarms of Manchurian coolies clad in cast-off soldiers' uniforms and equipped with stick frames on their backs almost overwhelmed us in their eagerness to carry our baggage. The customs inspectors, contrary to what we had been led to expect, were very courteous and fair.

They did not rip the bindings from our books nor help themselves to our provisions. After the inspection was over, *esvoschiks* drove us in their *droshkies*, small, low-wheeled carriages, to our quarters, some apartments in the upper story of a brick business house belonging to an interned Austrian. As soon as our baggage was in, the *dvornik*, the keeper of the court yard on which our apartment opened, called for our passports, took them to police headquarters for registration, and in due time returned them.

There had been no Bolshevik revolution in Eastern Siberia. News of the *coup d'état* in distant Petrograd was only beginning to come home to the various inhabitants of the city. We were informed that the upper classes did not think the situation at all serious. The latest reports on the 14th of November were, that Kerensky had succeeded in sweeping Moscow and Petrograd clear of the Bolsheviks, but that the Baltic Fleet and Kronstadt were yet to be recovered from them. Nevertheless, it was evident that the working classes had lost none of their spirit, which had recently been so elated by momentous news. The radical newspapers were speaking out boldly, and political posters addressed to the *tavarischi*, comrades, were covering the fences and walls.

The city was crowded with worn-out troops and war refugees from all over eastern and southeastern Europe. Eastern Siberia was the farther edge of Russia's great dumping ground. Three divisions, it was said, of disabled and demoralized Serbian soldiers were encamped several miles outside of the town. One of these Serbian soldiers, a man who had lived in the Canadian and American Northwest for fifteen years, was guide and interpreter for the local Y. M. C. A. secretary. We saw a number of Roumanian officers splendidly uniformed and heavily decorated dining at the Golden Horn. Along the railway to the north, at Khabarovsk, and along the Amur Valley were prison camps full of Germans, Austrians, and Hungarians, who were later to cause trouble.

There was no lack of food in Vladivostok. About the middle of the afternoon of the day we arrived,

"We had a good feed at the Golden Horn. Our experience on the ship had not led us to expect anything good from the Russian cuisines, but there was a surprise in store for us. There was good soup, without cabbage in it, and crab salad, or giant crab's legs, as we chose, served with excellent mayonnaise. All of us ordered omelet; and to our great surprise we were collectively served with one great omelet composed of seventy-two eggs, four for each man! We then had the choice of beefsteaks, roast chicken, roast goose, and a variety of game birds—ducks, partridges, and pheasants. There was no small variety of drinks. From the list of desserts, we took charlotte of apple, which was served with powdered sugar and cherry sauce. With the rouble down to seven or eight cents instead of fifty-one, we are able to have splendid dinners here at a cost of about fifty cents."

We were to leave for Petrograd on the evening of the 15th of November; and it was with some uncertainty that we made final preparations for the over-

land journey. Extravagant tales were dinned into our ears regarding thefts of baggage, scarcity of food, trouble with inspectors on the route, etc. Because it was said that conductors and porters objected to the crowding of the coaches, our leaders put our canvas rolls containing changes of clothing in the baggage car with our trunks. When we got on the train, we found there was plenty of room for luggage in our compartments, and our porters would never have offered objections. We discovered later that they had stored away sacks of sugar under our berths. The customs inspections at the borders of Manchuria turned out to be merely formal. The officials were hurried along down the corridors with explanations that we were an American commission.

The purchases of food we had made were not needed. Wherever the train stopped supplies of bread, game birds, pork and sausage were offered for sale at little booths outside the station. We took through to Moscow some of the foodstuffs we bought in Vladivostok. The inveterate tea drinking of the Russian was carefully provided for. At every station *kipiatok*, hot, boiled water could be had. As the train slowed down to a stop, there was a general jumping of men and boys from the steps and from the windows and a scurrying to the water-house where steaming, dripping faucets pierced the wall. The line-up was often picturesque, presenting as it did fair specimens of all the passengers on the train. A dining-car was attached, but it came to be a loafing place for argumentative Bolsheviks; and we resorted more and more to the booths. At the larger stations, too, there were dining rooms—buffets they were called—where one could get a boiled dinner of meat and potatoes. The station master always gave warning that the train was about to depart by tapping an outside bell—one bell three minutes before, then a half-minute warning, and, finally, the signal to go.

Manchuria, as we saw it from the train, in November, looked rather bare. There was a great deal of rolling and mountainous country. Pits which might serve for riflemen were to be seen all along the route; and little block-houses defended the stations. Manchuria and Mongolian marauders, it was said, still infested the country. Beyond Manchuria Station, where the road crossed into Siberia, we saw some cattle and camels on the hills; and these hills were less rugged than those in Manchuria. We had reached the upper waters of the Amur River. Here and there were Russian villages surrounded by forest and strips of arable land fenced with rails. In the center of the village was the blue-domed Russian Church. The people were as hospitable and friendly towards us as one could reasonably expect; and I had by accident an experience with them which forever after put me at ease when dealing with their kind. May I ask the reader's indulgence while I give the following account of it which I wrote out a day or two later?

"At Chita, we were told that the train would stay twenty minutes. I went into the waiting-room for first- and second-class passengers and found myself in a big crowd. After trying to buy a box of cara-

mels, I began to make my way back to the train, but I found that it had left the station. Thinking that it had backed up a siding or into a yard for fuel or water, I began making inquiries as well as I could—which attempt was poor enough—in Russian. I was soon told that the train had gone. The common platform loafers took an interest in me and ascertained that I was an American who had been left behind by the Petrograd Express. Instantly one of them offered to take me in hand. I followed him into the office of the station, where a well-uniformed and intelligent official began to ask me about my ticket. I told him that the conductor had it. He then asked me the numbers of my car, *coupé*, and berth. These I wrote on the back of a book. Luckily for me, the train had stopped at another station in the same town, and the officer caught it with the telephone.

"My friend from the platform then took me to a carriage back of the station, enquired the charge of the boy driver, found it to be two roubles, which I readily agreed to pay, and got in with me in the carriage. Under his admonitions, the boy whipped up the horses, and we went off down the road towards the other station.

"Soon we came to a railroad crossing guarded by soldiers. My friend tried to explain to them that he had with him an American trying to catch the Express. When with an air of finality the soldiers folded their guns in their arms and began pacing up and down the track in the lantern light and saying that they had been put there to guard that bridge and would let no one, not even an American, pass, my friend promptly climbed back into the carriage and ordered the boy to go by a roundabout way through the edge of the town. Of course, I could understand only by the signs that were made what was being done.

"We were east of Lake Baikal in Siberia; and our ride was long and cold. I frequently asked my friend whether the train would wait until we could reach the station, and he invariably answered yes (*da, da, da*). Nevertheless, I mentally took stock of my material and intellectual equipment for a stay in the land of the exiles. . . . The Russian words I could remember were about one hundred and fifty; but I had no grammar or dictionary of any kind. More than once I felt convinced that the train would not wait and that I was certainly up against a difficult proposition; but everything seemed so homelike and friendly about the people we passed in the dark, and my companion-guide seemed so faithful and honest that I could not be alarmed. I managed to summon enough Russian words to ask him how many people lived in the town and whether there were good hotels. His replies were reassuring.

Finally, we came to a railroad yard in the vicinity of the station, and we had to leave the carriage. When I shelled out some eight or ten roubles in fifty kopeck pieces for the boy, who had driven us so far, my companion picked up all over two roubles and made me take it back. We then started across the railroad

yard, scrambling under and over lines of cars. To my great relief, we crossed the main track just ahead of the engines of our Petrograd Express, which was quietly waiting for me. I thanked my guide, shoved the extra money which he had refused to let me give to the boy into his hands and climbed on the train.

"Our porter raised a great, friendly hullabaloo as soon as he saw me, got in behind me, shoved me along down the train, and put me in my compartment and shut the door. He raised a great laugh and then opened the door. He has not yet quit joking me about it. '*Nie gooliatie*,' he says when the train stops; but I am willing enough to keep within a safe distance of the steps."

From Chita we travelled in the night to the neighborhood of Lake Baikal, which we first saw about nine o'clock the next morning. It was a beautiful expanse of water reaching out much farther than the eye could see, like the Great Lakes in America, and we spent most of the day going around the southern end of it. The country was covered with forest, and on the south was a range of snow-capped mountains. At the station booths strings of sausage gave place to rows of fine looking fish and pans full of broiled game birds—partridges, sage hens, and pheasants. When the train reached the western side of the lake, the road turned up the valley of a small stream, and we soon reached Irkutsk, the chief city of central Siberia.

So far we had seen no signs of any Bolshevik uprisings, but the Revolution was to become something of reality to us when we reached Krasnoiarsk, a division point on the Yenesee River. There a representative of the United States Department of Commerce came on board the train with the news that the Bolsheviks had taken charge of the town. It was here that one of the most obstinate risings had occurred during the Revolution of 1905. The bourgeoisie had adopted "strike tactics," and all business houses were closed. It was reported that the Cossacks were coming in considerable force, and the main streets of the town were commanded by machine guns. In Siberia and Russia, it was always the Cossacks who were going to clean up the Bolsheviks. Bloodshed was daily expected, and the situation was tense. With the trade representative was an interesting Swede who had married a Chicago girl. He was a consul or consular agent for both the Swedish and American governments, but his business was trafficking in furs up and down the Yenesee. There was also a Britisher along, whom the American trade representative had employed as interpreter.

From near Tomsk, which is not on the railroad main line, our train ran along the fifty-fifth parallel of latitude across the level steppes of western Siberia to the Urals. This country reminded me of the American Great Plains, but the altitude was low and in some places the meadows looked marshy. One instinctively felt that he was nearer the frozen North, which feeling was probably increased by the crossing of great rivers running into the Arctic. The timber, where

there was any, consisted chiefly of white-barked birches, which grew about as high as the roofs of the coaches. Most of the country was covered with grass. A two-inch snow had fallen; but it was easy to see that the growth in the summer had been luxuriant. The peasants had made cuttings and had stacked the hay on the open plain. There were few fences. One of the picturesque sights of a late afternoon is a string of five or six ponies drawing sleighs to the hay fields or returning with what we would call quarter-loads of hay. One sometimes thought what the Americans might do in the course of fifty or a hundred years if ten million of them were turned loose on the eastern slopes of the Urals. They would spread across that plain and make it one of the great food-producing regions of the world. The cost of transportation has been a great obstacle to the proper development of this country. The long hauls by rail east and west cut down the profits in wheat, but the British steamers have begun to come around North Cape and up to warehouses along the Obi River; and the Russians are waking up to their new opportunities. Dairy and stock-farm products well prepared for the market were much in evidence at the station booths. Our porter filled up some empty compartments with bread, cheese, dressed fowls (chiefly big, fat geese), and excellent butter, which he no doubt sold in Petrograd, if he escaped vagrant soldiers, at a very high profit.

We were able to get very little news while on the trip across Siberia. The local papers published a few telegrams and much copy from old Petrograd and Moscow papers. They reminded one of the sheets to be had at stations in Nevada and Arizona. Rumors circulated freely, and everybody appeared to believe them, at least for the moment. Whenever we passed an eastbound train, the passengers interviewed each other vigorously. At one place we heard that there had been severe fighting in Moscow, that fifty thousand had been killed and the Kremlin destroyed. The Bolsheviks were roundly cursed for their vandalism. At another place we heard that all was quiet and peaceful in Moscow and Petrograd, which the Bolsheviks had secured, and that Kerensky was at the front with the loyal section of the army.

Our train swept along the rising steppes towards the Ural Mountains, which, so far as I could see from the train as we crossed them, were not very high or rough. They were about like the Berkshire Hills of Massachusetts. The country was covered with a thick growth of pines about seventy-five feet high, and through them the woodmen had cut great swaths. Wood and timbers were piled high at the railway stations, for cord wood was used to fire the engines and the furnaces of the cars. Supplying the wood and clearing the snow off the tracks furnished employment to the villagers. Many women and girls worked in the snow.

From the Urals to Vologda there was little to write about. The train ran for miles and miles through young bamboo pine which had sprung up after the last cutting. Nearer Vologda the country became more

level and open and the villages more numerous. We arrived in Vologda early in the morning. Serbian soldiers, who had come from France and England by way of Archangel, so we heard, were to be seen scattered about with the Russian soldiers at the station. Some of them had been to America, and several could speak English. The Serbians were enthusiastically loyal to the Allies and thoroughly detested the course the Bolsheviks had taken in Russia.

We stayed at Vologda nearly all day trying to get a train to Moscow, for Y. M. C. A. headquarters had been transferred to that city from Petrograd. I soon found some comrades among the Serbians and set out alone with them to see the town which later became the headquarters of Ambassador Francis. "It was just about such a business place as San Jose, California, or Berkeley; but, of course, it was different." There appeared to be an abundance of food and miscellaneous articles of merchandise.

"Towards evening it was found that an ordinary 'post train' would leave Vologda several hours earlier than the Express. Christy decided that James and I should take this train to Moscow and give notice to Headquarters that our party was coming. The Express with the main party passed us in the night and arrived in Moscow four and one-half hours ahead of us.

"Travelling on the 'post train,' a local train, is something of an experience. When it rolled into the Vologda station, there was a wild scramble for places. James and I, with the assistance of several of our party, succeeded in getting inside our car, but the compartment was locked. The open second and third class bunks were all filled with soldiers. Soldiers were in the passage way, on the floor, packed away in the toilet—everywhere! Three stalwart Georgians (people from the Caucasus) and two of their women, all of whom had been on the Siberian train in the same car with James, soon came jamming into the car towards us. Seeing our trouble with the door, the Georgians proposed to open it; and into the compartment they piled. One of them said, 'There are only five of us. There will be room for all.' Their baggage and ours filled the upper berth, the shelves, and the floor. The two women sat in the lower berth. Their men (husbands) lay down on the baggage on the floor. The other Georgian slept outside somewhere. James sat in a corner of the lower berth with the feet of those women in his lap, when they laid down on one another to sleep. By a quiet rearrangement of bundles and suitcases in the upper berth, I got about one-third of it clear, so that I had a place to put my back. My head was up in the corner by the candle lantern, and my feet and legs were distributed over the piled-up baggage high in the air."

The passengers traveled in that crowded condition for hours and hours. There was no relief to be had, except when the train made long halts at stations, where we usually got off and walked.

Moscow was safely in the hands of the Bolsheviks, but the city had not been damaged severely by the fighting of a few weeks before, when the Bolsheviks

had overthrown the existing authorities. Here and there one could see where a machine gun or rifles had raked the pavement and walls of buildings down a street. There were numerous bullet holes in plate-glass windows. A very few buildings had been burned. The severest fighting appeared to have taken place around the Metropolitan Hotel and the Kremlin, but the latter was not badly damaged. The offices and apartments of the Y. M. C. A. were located in the mansion of a wealthy gentleman who was abroad with his family. The house was under the protection of the American Consul-General, who had secured it for the use of our organization, but the retinue of domestic servants and great watchdogs remained to take care of the property. During the period of hostilities, a young Russian soldier had shot at the house from behind corners and trees along the boulevard, until one of the secretaries of long experience in Russia ventured out through a side-door and asked the boy why he was shooting at that house. He said it was well known whose house it was and firing from the windows had been reported. When he was told who the present occupants were and that it was all a mistake about there having been firing from the windows, the soldier begged pardon, shouldered his gun, and went away. By the time our party arrived, November 27, 1917, order had been restored, the city was fairly well policed by Red Guards, and the people were going about their business as usual. The soldiers had already begun to return from the front. Great crowds of them in orderless squads under no command whatever came tramping through the streets with the arrival of every train. Yet they created very little disorder. These men were simply weary of the war and were on their way home with the grub sacks and cooking utensils on their backs. There were, however, some irregularities at night. After eleven-thirty it was not quite safe to be out on the streets in a good overcoat. Shots rang out now and then on the crisp night air. Motion-picture houses, however, were very well attended, and the crowds were not molested.

About the first of December elections were held for the Constituent Assembly, which was to meet in Petrograd in January. Thirteen or more parties or factions were represented on the ballot, and women electioneers were much in evidence. While the election booths were guarded, and nobody was allowed to enter without identification, there was no complaint of military interference.

Ordinarily the bourgeoisie appeared to be simply helpless. They sat around and waited for the Bolshevik movement to run its own course and fall. Yet there was always some quiet scheming, as we later found out from people who gave us their confidence. Many of the bourgeoisie wished for the return of the monarchy, but they wanted a constitutional monarchy. The press was not yet muzzled; and the Bolsheviks were subjected to unsparing criticism. The conservative papers were masterful and more than the equals of some of our dignified American organs in their expression of refined ridicule. The Bolshevik press, on the other hand, indulged itself to the limit in counter-

denunciation and in telling the bourgeoisie "where to get off"—the State could do very well without them and might take some means to get rid of them.

The food problem had not, in December, 1917, become very serious. The distribution of bread was carefully regulated, at least for the bourgeoisie. The best restaurants and hotels were not allowed to have any, but the common restaurants were usually well supplied; of other food there was enough. Prices were high; dinners consisting of soup, vegetables, and meat—roast beef, veal or pork cutlets, and roast goose were the meats usually available—cost about fifteen roubles. A soft drink cost about three roubles; and dessert, almost invariably canned cherries, cost five roubles. At the vegetarian restaurants, which were numerous in Moscow, one could get meals of vegetables, dairy products, and eggs for five or six roubles. A Belgian acquaintance once took me to the restaurant of a fashionable club where we were privileged to pay fifty-four roubles for two servings of boiled white fish without any bread and two glasses of cider, or twenty-seven roubles each. My friend then invited me to dinner at his home.

This young Belgian, born in Russia, was a member of a family of cotton manufacturers. Until the outbreak of the war, it was the custom of the parents to take their children to Brussels and Paris for a season each year. The language of the home was French, but the young man and his brother could both read and speak Russian, German, and English. At the dinner there was present a Belgian friend of the family, a wealthy munitions manufacturer. On the table were roast pork, roast chicken, potatoes, Brussels sprouts, white bread and tea biscuits, and both wine and champagne. When I remarked that this board did not represent the "starving Moscow" of which I had heard, my host replied that at the beginning of the war his father had laid in great stores of flour, and that the liquors had been brought from France many years before. "One cannot buy good wines and champagne in Russia, for the Russians always mix their stocks with vodka or other native liquids in order to make a greater quantity and so get more money." The pork, chicken, potatoes, and other vegetables were secured by faithful servants who knew how to manipulate the dealers. Later I learned that the father had also shown good judgment in converting his cotton mill properties into foreign securities immediately after the March Revolution while prospects for Russia looked brighter than ever to a great many people.

Leaflet No. 48 of The [English] Historical Association (January, 1920) is indicative of the growing interest in Europe in the history of the United States. The leaflet contains a nine-page bibliography of American history arranged under two divisions: The colonial period, and the period from 1776 to the present. Under each heading there are brief lists of sources, society publications, and general historical works. The leaflet was prepared for English use by the American scholars, Profs. C. R. Fish and W. Notestein.

John Dickinson, Statesman and Patriot

BY PROFESSOR D. C. SHILLING, MONMOUTH COLLEGE.

The purpose of this article is not to attempt a new study of the life and works of John Dickinson, but rather to suggest that his life and works should be more widely and more favorably known. At the present time Mr. Dickinson is known only by a relatively few who are specialists or near-specialists in American Colonial history. Every writer for half a century has made us familiar with the life and deeds of such revolutionary leaders as James Otis, Patrick Henry, Samuel Adams, John Hancock, Joseph Warren and a score of others. The boys and girls of our public schools can readily identify these men and approximate their contribution to the American Revolution. But the name and deeds of John Dickinson are almost wholly unknown, not only to the boys and girls of the public schools, but also to the teachers of our grammar and high schools. At least this has been proven by the writer's experience with his college classes and in large classes in summer schools in Ohio and Michigan where a considerable majority of the classes have been teachers of our upper grade and high schools.

If it were necessary to explain why Dickinson should be known and studied it would only be necessary to mention that almost every inter-colonial document or set of resolutions from the beginning of the struggle in 1764 to the Declaration of Independence was written by John Dickinson, and was largely the product of his own fertile brain. An eminent historian has said that "in the literature of that struggle his position is as pre-eminent as Washington in war, Franklin in diplomacy and Morris in finance. From no other leader of that movement originated a series of arguments of half the number, importance and popularity."¹ No reader is apt to dispute this statement if he recalls that Dickinson wrote the "Declaration of Rights" and the "Petition to the King," both of which were adopted by the Stamp Act Congress; the "Address of Congress to the Inhabitants of the Province of Quebec" and the first "Petition of Congress to the King's Most Excellent Majesty," sent out by the First Continental Congress, and in 1775 a second "Petition to the King." The Second Continental Congress asked him to draw up a "Declaration setting Forth Causes of the Necessity of Taking up Arms." Mention might also be made of his essay on the "Constitutional Powers of Great Britain over Colonies in America," the "Farmer's Letters," "A Song for American Freedom," the first draft of the Articles of Confederation and the letters signed "Fabius."

Moses Coit Tyler, in his admirable "Literary History of the American Revolution," points out that

James Otis was the politico-literary character of the period 1764-1767, John Dickinson during the period 1767-1775, and Thomas Paine from 1776 to 1783.² In quantity and perhaps in quality the works of Mr. Dickinson far exceed those of either of his illustrious compeers, and few if any will deny that the epithet, "Penman of the Revolution," rightfully belongs to John Dickinson.

While not an office-seeker at any time of his career, Mr. Dickinson spent a considerable part of his active life in state and federal office. Four years after his return from his law studies in Middle Temple, London, he was a member of the Delaware Assembly; the three years preceding the Stamp Act and the two previous to the Declaration of Independence he sat in the assembly of Pennsylvania, which state he also represented in the Stamp Act Congress and the First Continental Congress. Moving back to Delaware, he represented that state in congress in 1779, and two years later was chosen governor of Delaware. Returning to Pennsylvania, he was elected governor, or as it was then called, president, of Pennsylvania in 1781. He again moved into Delaware, and was sent by that state to the Constitutional Convention.

The reader has already asked why one who had so much to do with the entire revolutionary struggle is so little known, and in some instances so unfavorably known? An answer to this question will necessitate an examination of Mr. Dickinson's conception of the relation of the colonies to the mother country, and his idea of the way to secure redress of American grievances. Perhaps a full explanation is impossible without cognizance of the attitude that most of our historians have taken in the whole controversy between England and her colonies in America.

As has been pointed out above, Mr. Dickinson was the mouthpiece for the colonies during the ten years preceding the Declaration of Independence. Few, if any, of the colonial statesmen were more insistent upon the rights of the colonists, and perhaps no one in the colonies excelled him in interpreting the genius of the British government. From his study of English history and constitutional law he had observed that for several centuries the controversies between the people and the Crown over questions involving the rights and privileges of the people usually had been decided in favor of the people, and as a result of repeated remonstrances and petitions. He would go so far as to demand redress with arms in hand, as had done the barons at Runnymede, and as we have observed, Congress asked him to draw up the Declaration of Causes for Taking up Arms. By the beginning of 1776 the idea of securing the rights which the colonists desired by petition and remonstrance had

¹ P. L. Ford, in the preface to his *Writings of John Dickinson*, p. 9.

² Volume II, 21-34.

been abandoned by a few resourceful leaders who now openly espoused independence. These leaders were so skilful in the use of propaganda that they persuaded Congress to issue the immortal Declaration.

In the light of what has been said of Mr. Dickinson's views of the *method* of settling the colonial dispute, the reader will not be surprised to learn that he openly opposed independence when that question was brought before the congress. In his "Vindication,"³ published in 1783, he says: "I confess that I opposed the making of the declaration of independence *at the time when it was made*. The right and the authority of congress to make it, the justice of making it, I acknowledged. The policy of *then* making it I disputed." Without denying the accuracy of this statement, it is well to remember that it was written after Independence was won and in defence of his action in 1776.

In the absence of complete records of the proceedings of Congress it is impossible to show just what were the arguments of Dickinson in 1776, but from the fragments which were kept, and from his subsequent correspondence, it seems pretty clear that his two strong objections were the lack of unity among the colonies and the uncertainty of foreign aid. He was not deceived by the hope of a reconciliation, because as he later expressed it, after the rejection of the last petition, "not a syllable to my recollection was ever uttered in favor of a reconciliation with Great Britain."⁴ In fairness to Mr. Dickinson it is well to remember that the issuing of the Declaration of Independence *at the time it was issued* was opposed by such well known men as Jay, Duane, Rutledge, Read and Robert Livingston. Also that two weeks after its adoption, Robert Morris wrote that "it was an improper time," and that the Declaration "will neither promote the interest nor redound to the honor of America, for it has caused division when he wanted union."⁵ Regardless of whether or not we agree with the course Dickinson pursued we are not apt to censure Hildreth for pronouncing the action of Mr. Dickinson the "noblest proof of moral courage ever shown by a public man in the history of the country."⁶ Many of his old friends dropped him, and Adams expressed his regrets "because of the forward part he (Dickinson) took in the beginning of the controversy." But as Stille puts it, "the public life of Mr. Dickinson was eclipsed, but not extinguished by the attitude he assumed in regard to the Declaration of Independence."⁷

Early in 1775 Pennsylvania began to arm and drill her citizens. Philadelphia raised five battalions at once, and more than doubled this number in spite of internal disorders of a formidable sort. When New York was in danger of attack in January of 1776,

Congress sent an urgent call for troops. On February 15 three battalions of the Philadelphia "Associators" under the command of Colonel John Dickinson were detailed for this service. (A delay of orders till after the Declaration caused a change of program.) It may be of interest to note that but one other member of Congress left his seat for a place at the front. The radical Whigs of Pennsylvania who were stopping at no half-way measures determined to ostracize those who had not supported the movement for the Declaration of Independence. As a consequence, Mr. Dickinson lost his seat in Congress. Years after he wrote, "Yes, while I was exposing my person to *every hazard* and lodging every night *within half a mile* of hostile troops that the members of the convention at Philadelphia might slumber and vote in quiet and safety they ignominiously voted me, as unworthy of my seat, out of the national senate."⁸ The same radical element virtually forced his resignation as colonel of the "Associators" by the manner in which military elections were conducted. Mr. Dickinson moved into Delaware, volunteered as a private, and next we hear of him "carrying a musket" at the Battle of Brandywine. His old political opponent—McKean—now governor, appointed him brigadier-general of the Delaware militia, an office which he held but a few months. The military career of John Dickinson has been presented in considerable detail in order to show justification for the term "Patriot" at the head of this article, and to disprove the old cry that he was a peace-at-any-price man, and even by some, a Tory.

When experience had proven the Articles of Confederation inadequate, and the commercial interests issued a call for a meeting at Annapolis, Delaware sent Dickinson who was chosen president of the convention. As is well known, the delegates at Annapolis decided to call a general convention to meet at Philadelphia "to make the federal government adequate to the exigencies of the Union." Delaware once more called upon the services of her distinguished citizen. In the constitutional convention Mr. Dickinson was a persistent champion of the small states and supported the New Jersey plan. During the convention he wrote Madison that he would "sooner submit to a foreign power than submit to be deprived of an equality of suffrage in both branches of the legislature, and thereby be thrown under the domination of the large states."⁹ As his biographer puts it, "He was at all times the champion of the senate as the guardian and representative of the states."¹⁰ However, his leaning toward state sovereignty did not keep him from supporting Madison's proposition that congress should have power to repeal any state law that was considered contrary to the constitution of the United States.

When the constitution was submitted to the states for ratification a great deal of opposition developed,

³ Given in full in Stille's *Life and Writings of John Dickinson*, pp. 364-414.

⁴ Quoted by Stille, p. 196.

⁵ *Ibid.*, 197.

⁶ *Ibid.*, 196.

⁷ *Ibid.*, 201.

⁸ Dickinson's "Vindication," p. 25; Stille, 385.

⁹ Madison's Writings (Hunt Edition), III, 166.

¹⁰ Stille, p. 262.

and it required very skilful maneuvering by the friends of the document to insure its acceptance by the states.¹¹ Every schoolboy knows that Jay, Madison and Hamilton published a series of letters now known as the "Federalist," which exerted a powerful influence in securing the ratification of the constitution, but who except the professional historian has ever heard of the nine letters by John Dickinson which bore the pseudonym of "Fabius," and which presented strong arguments for the ratification of the new instrument of government. To show that their value was then recognized we have the following testimony from Washington: "The writer of the pieces signed *Fabius*, whoever he is, appears to be master of his subject; he treats it with dignity, and at the same time expresses himself in such a manner as to render it intelligible to every capacity. I have no doubt but an extensive republication of those numbers would be of utility in removing the impressos which have been made upon the minds of many by an unfair or partial representation of the proposed constitution, and would afford desirable information upon the subject to those who sought for it."¹² Why most of our erudite historical writers fail to even mention these letters in their treatises of this period is an interesting question, especially so when we have knowledge that the judicious Washington thought them valuable in forming a favorable opinion of the proposed constitution.

Mr. Dickinson was a warm supporter of the constitution, but he soon became alarmed at the centralizing program of the Federalists, and drew more and more toward the Jeffersonian party. Many who were Federalists in 1788 did not follow the party in its program of consolidation during the first few years of Washington's administration. John Dickinson and Patrick Henry are interesting examples of this shifting of party affiliation in the decade following the adoption of the constitution. Henry, the ardent Anti-Federalist, became a Federalist, and Dickinson, the staunch Federalist, enlisted under the banner of the Jeffersonian Republicans.

The public official career of Mr. Dickinson ended with the making of the constitution. His poor health and his love for retirement caused him to refuse official position. So determined was he in this regard that even his close friends could not persuade him to become a candidate for the United States Senate.

¹¹ The old halo which has surrounded the making of the constitution is disappearing, and the whole truth is now being presented. One may be said to be orthodox, even if he suggests that very little of the outburst of democracy prevalent in 1776 found its way into the constitution. In the *World's Work*, July, 1919, p. 254, Prof. W. E. Dodd says that "Our Federal Constitution . . . was exceedingly unpopular when it was adopted against the wishes of a majority of the American people. Its purpose was very largely to enable creditors to collect the interest and principal of loans made in support of the American Revolution."

¹² Letter to John Vaughn, April 27, 1788, given in Stille, p. 274.

However, Dickinson did not lose his interest in political affairs, as is attested by his correspondence with such men as Governor McKean and Thomas Jefferson. His conversion to the Jeffersonian program is clearly revealed in a letter to Governor McKean on the eve of the election of 1800, in which he hopes that "many thousands" of "deluded" Pennsylvanians will turn Republican and oppose their "deluders" whom he thought "hostile to liberty and the best interests of mankind." The inauguration of Jefferson, he wrote, "completes the wishes of those who sincerely love their country."¹³ Throughout the first administration of Jefferson a very intimate correspondence passed between Dickinson and the President, however the reader must not infer that he was simply an understudy of the great Virginian. He was unalterably opposed to the purchase of Louisiana and differed from Jefferson on other important points. These differences did not impair their friendship, and the news of the death of Mr. Dickinson caused Jefferson to write a beautiful tribute to his memory. "A more estimable man or truer patriot could not have left us. . . . His name will be consecrated in history as one of the great worthies of the Revolution."¹⁴

The limitations of this article as set by the title and as enunciated in the purpose do not warrant a consideration of the private and professional life of the man whose public services are here considered. The writer will be fully satisfied and amply rewarded if this humble contribution arouses any interest in, and a more just appreciation of, John Dickinson—the "Penman of the Revolution." It is the conviction of the writer that such epithets as "a tame and spineless creature," a peace-at-any-price man, and even the stronger term—Tory—are unwarranted by the facts, and that the silence in regard to the services of Mr. Dickinson is unworthy of American scholarship, and not in harmony with our desire for impartial and unbiased judgment.

"China and the Powers," by Henry Cockburn, C.B., appears in *The Quarterly Review* for January, 1920. In it the author reviews the relations between China and England since the Opium War, and also traces the growth of intercourse among China, Russia, France and Germany. He explains the reform in China as being stimulated by "alarm at foreign encroachments, actual and threatened," which excited "not only alarm but anger; and the anger was felt by many who were quite untouched by any perception of a need of change. Far from their being led by events toward the adoption of Western ideas, animosity to the foreigners served in their case to intensify repugnance to reform, since reform was avowedly based on those ideas."

¹³ See these two interesting letters in Stille, pp. 286-287.

¹⁴ Jefferson to Bringham, February 24, 1808; given by Stille, pp. 336-337.

The Personality of Robespierre—Source Study for College Classes¹

BY PROFESSOR H. E. BOURNE, WESTERN RESERVE UNIVERSITY.

This group of source selections may serve a double purpose. It should enable students to form a fairly well-defined idea of Robespierre's personality. It should also afford an opportunity of weighing the value of testimony upon the characteristics which are the essential elements of such an idea.

The men and women who recorded the impressions given in the selections all came into direct contact with Robespierre. Many of them had ample occasion to observe his conduct and to note his personal characteristics. This does not mean that the impressions they give possess photographic exactitude. Various circumstances and prejudices may have influenced their words. Mere lapse of time may have blurred and distorted the original impression. To see what use can be made of such material and to combine the principal elements into a reasonable character sketch will be the task of the student.

It is obvious that such work will have only a limited and provisional value, for the student will have neither time nor opportunity to gain a detailed knowledge of each witness and of his relation to Robespierre, or attitude towards him, as the Revolution passed from one phase to another. To facilitate a rough and ready estimate of such conditions a few of the most essential facts about the witnesses are given in notes at the close of each selection. About several of the writers little that is enlightening has been preserved in accessible form.

It has been thought best at this time not to complicate the problem by introducing selections from the newspapers of the day. It is, however, intended later to supplement these impressions of Robespierre's contemporaries by references which he makes to himself in his writings and speeches.

Before a class undertakes to work upon the material here the members should read carefully some brief account of Robespierre's career, like that in the last edition of the *Encyclopedia Britannica*. Other references are given in the Bibliographical List.

For some years there has been in France a revival of interest in Robespierre's career, especially under the influence of Prof. Albert Mathiez, the editor of *Les Annales Révolutionnaires*. Rival editions of his works were in course of publication when the World War broke out. It is to be hoped that the collections of material in Arras were not destroyed during the bombardment of that ill-fated city.

At the close of the selections will be found suggestions for a method of using the evidence they contain.

BIBLIOGRAPHY.

NOTE.—The sources of the selections are indicated at the head of each.

F. A. Aulard, *Les Grands Orateurs de la Révolution*, pp. 215-300.

H. Buffenoir, *Les Portraits de Robespierre*.

Hilaire Belloc, *Robespierre: A Study*.

Encyclopedia Britannica, article "Robespierre."

Ernest Hamel, *Histoire de Robespierre, d'après des Papiers de Famille*, 3 volumes.

G. H. Lewis, *Life of Maximilian Robespierre*.

Albert Mathiez, *Etudes Robespierriennes*, Vol. I, Chapter VIII.

John Morley, *Miscellanies*, Vol. I, 60-134.

A. J. Paris, *La Jeunesse de Robespierre*.

H. A. Taine, *French Revolution*, Vol. III, 143-168.

Charles Vellay, *Discours et Rapports de Robespierre*, Introduction, I-XX.

I. A GROUP OF FORMAL PORTRAITS.

By L. Duperron, in *Vie Secrette, politique et curieuse de M. J. M. Robespierre*. Paris, an II (1794):

Here is a portrait that has been made of this tyrant of a day, whom one severe glance of liberty has plunged into the tomb. He was thirty-five years old. He was five feet two or three inches tall. His carriage was erect, his step firm, quick, even a little brusque. He kept shutting his hands convulsively. A similar motion affected his shoulder and his neck, as he turned his head to the right or the left. His clothing was well groomed and his hair always dressed with care. His physiognomy had nothing remarkable about it, though it was a trifle forbidding. His complexion was yellow, if not livid; his eyes dull and expressionless. He frequently blinked as if in consequence of that convulsive nervousness to which I have alluded. He always carried sweets about with him. Although his voice was naturally harsh and even shrill, he knew how to soften it and to give grace to his *Artesian* accent. However, he never looked an honest man in the face.

He had perceived the prestige to be won from effective declamation, and, to a degree, he possessed talent for it. He could state a case fairly well in the tribune. Antithesis was a marked feature of his style. He used irony often with effect. But his style was not sustained; his diction now harmoniously modulated, now imperfect, occasionally brilliant, sometimes, indeed often, trivial, was always interspersed with commonplaces and digressions upon *virtue*, *crime*, *conspiracy*. A mediocre orator, when he had prepared his speeches, if he attempted improvisation he was beneath mediocrity. Then he sought after his fugitive ideas as a man in sleep after the phantoms

¹ See other studies for the use of college classes in *THE HISTORICAL OUTLOOK* for November, 1919, and January, 1920.

of his dreams. His logic was always correct enough, and he often excelled in adroit sophistry. In refutation he was clear. On the whole, however, his ideas were sterile, and his thought without breadth, as almost always happens to persons too much occupied with themselves. . . .

Pp. 23-25.

NOTE.—Aulard (*Etudes*, 6th série, note p. 176) says that the physical part of this portrait appeared textually in several other libels, notably:

Hist. caractère de M.R. et anecdotes sur ses successeurs. Hambourg, s. d., de 52 pp.

Portraits exécrationnels du traître Robespierre et ses complices, s. l. n. d., en 18.

Portrait de Robespierre avec la réception de Fouquier-Tinville aux enfers par Danton et Samille Desmoulins, par J. J. Dussault, Paris, s. d., en 8.

Véritable portraits de Catilina Robespierre, tiré d'après. Nature, s. l. n. d., en 8.

(Further information in regard to Duperron is unavailable.)

By M. Devienne, formerly attorney at the Council of Artois; from a manuscript communicated by M. H. Renard to Paris, author of *La Jeunesse de Robespierre*, p. 76:

I knew M. Robespierre very well. His appearance was commonplace. He was of medium height, with broad shoulders and a rather small head. His hair was light chestnut, his countenance oval, his skin moderately pitted with smallpox. His nose was small and short, his eyes blue and somewhat deep set. He did not look one in the eyes, his approach was chilly, almost repellent. His smile was infrequent, and even then it was rather sardonic.

By P. L. Roederer, written in August, 1794, when it appeared under the caption, "Merlin de Thionville, représentant du peuple, à ses collègues." *Oeuvres*, III, 267-271:

Persons who find amusement in discovering relations between faces and moral qualities, and between human faces and animals, have remarked that as Danton had the head of a bull dog, Marat that of an eagle, Mirabeau that of a lion, Robespierre's head was like a cat. But his face changed its expression; it was first the restless, although gentle, look of the family cat; then the fierce look of the wild cat; then the ferocious glare of the tiger cat.

Robespierre was by temperament inclined to melancholy, but in the end he became sour. At the Constituent Assembly his complexion was pale and lifeless; at the Convention it became yellow and livid. . . .

The powers of his mind were always limited, but at bottom they were fairly sound. He had few ideas but they were firmly held, little imagination but a retentive memory; slight movement of thought but always in the same direction. . . .

He never accumulated knowledge. Nothing remained of the sterile studies he had pursued at college, nor of his practice of the bar. He had not the slightest notion of administration or of negotiation. . . . Robespierre felt none but the lesser passions which proceed from self-love, that is to say, envy, hatred, vengeance. Furthermore, these passions lacked the support of courage. . . .

His style has always been loose and diffuse, with-

out color or life. The reason is simple. All his notions were vague and confused. He had few and found it hard to express even these. . . .

Robespierre possessed to a high degree the art of perfidious insinuation. He could never rely upon frank persuasion or energetic conviction. . . .

In 1790 and 1791 it was very hard for him to gain access to the tribune or to make himself listened to when he was there, he was so obscure and misty, tedious and heavy. He would never have commanded the attention of the Assembly, had he not first commanded that of the galleries. And he would never have obtained this without the jugglery of the prophetic pose, which he practiced to great advantage when the revisers had justified his preceding declamations, and above all without the adulation in which he wallowed under the gaze of those galleries. . . .

Who of us has ever seen him accomplish any act? I do not refer merely to the time of peril when he remained hidden, but also to calmer circumstances. It is very noteworthy that this man, who has caused so much talk in the last six years, who from appearances one would infer carried the weightiest responsibility in the two assemblies, has never put a single line in the forty volumes of laws which these assemblies produced. Moreover, in the revolutionary measures which have been taken during the last two years, there is not one which he devised, although several deserved his close support. . . .

It is because he has done nothing, while circumstances worked for him, that he acquired this supremacy of a year. . . .

They called him at first the Patriot Robespierre, then the Incorruptible Robespierre, finally the Great Robespierre. The day came when the Great Robespierre was called tyrant, and on this day a sans-culotte, gazing at him as he was stretched out upon a pallet at the Committee of General Security, said, "That a tyrant! Is that all?"

NOTE.—Aulard regards this as one of the better literary portraits. *Etudes*, VI, 173.

(Pierre Louis Roederer (1754-1833); councillor et parlement of Metz; deputy of Third Estate of Metz to States General; procureur-général-syndic of Paris in 1792 until August 10, writer on *Journal de Paris*; distinguished official under Consulate and Empire, made count by Napoleon.)

By Comte de Montgaillard, in *State of France in 1794*. Translated by Joshua Lucock Wilkinson. Preface dated June 25, 1794. Translation dated July 26, 1794. Pp. 9-10:

Robespierre is in complexion weak and puny; his figure dark and livid; his sight short and weak, and his voice nearly gone; he possesses none of those natural advantages, which prepossess or seduce the multitude; he is almost passionless, or rather, perhaps, he conceals with the most profound art, what would detract from his popularity and success. In the eyes of the people he possesses a character of incorruptibility, which hath preserved his influence against all the attacks of the Brissotins, and of the Commune of Paris. Solely confined, in appearance, to his functions of Member of the Committee of Public Safety, and of Jacobin, Robespierre shows every appearance

of the most unaffected man. This modesty in triumph, this economy of person, and the obscurity of his private life, have so long secured him the popular favour; he lives as he did in 1790, neither altering his manners, nor his tastes, and always changeless. Sheltered behind the populace, whose excesses he favours, speaking little, but to the point; magnifying the errors of his adversaries, in all the events of the civil and foreign war, he boldly seized the direction of the Revolution from the timorous Brissotins. . . .

(Jean Gabriel Maurice Roques, Comte de Montgaillard (1761-1841); emigrated after August 10, but soon returned to Paris; probably became secret agent of the government, rumor saying he had relations with Robespierre; in 1794 saw Pitt in London; his account of France published during this visit; continued career as diplomatic agent and conspirator.)

By Vicomte de Toulangeon, in *L'Histoire de France depuis la Révolution de 1789*, III, 63-64:

Robespierre was short and slender. His features were not distinctive, and in repose were insignificant. They never took on the glow of action or of lively emotion. When he became deeply excited the muscles of his countenance swelled, its contours fell, and it was overspread by a green and livid tint. . . .

The opening periods of his prepared discourses often recalled the manner of Demosthenes. Almost always he then wandered into common places without connection or continuity. But Robespierre did not address the legislators, he addressed the galleries, and he knew his audience. He appealed to passions and he declaimed. He was careful never to compromise himself in private conversations or in social discussions. He preached, he did not argue, and never condescended to prove or persuade. This sententious, dogmatic, and magisterial tone was well calculated to impose upon the multitude. He wished sectaries and not colleagues or friends, whom he would not have found. . . .

(François Emmanuel, Vicomte de Toulangeon (1748-1812); deputy of nobility of Lans-le-Saunier to States General; his history published in 1801-1810.)

From the *Mémoires* of Charlotte Robespierre, re-edited in *Revue Historique de la Révolution Française*, I, 110 f.:

. . . He was of middle height and a delicate complexion. His countenance breathed gentleness and goodness, but had not as handsome regular features as his brother. Almost always there was a smile on his face. A great number of portraits of my elder brother have been published. The one which bore the closest resemblance was by Delpech. There are others which are only odious accusations, disfiguring his countenance, in order to give him a ferocious expression. . . .

One may form an idea of man's injustice when it is known that several of my brother's enemies had no other griefs against him than the fact that he met them on the street and did not notice them or return their salutation. Maximilian was very absentminded, or rather, he was preoccupied. He sometimes passed his intimate friends without seeing them. . . .

A comparison with Danton:

The former in his manners did not preserve always the dignity suited to the representative of a great people. His toilette was disorderly. The bearing of Robespierre was correct. He was grave without haughtiness. His clothing was carefully chosen and kept scrupulously clean. Danton had a stormy mind, a tumultuous eloquence which for the moment produced striking effects. My brother's mind was prudent and calm, examining things and weighing them coolly. The feature of his speeches was not great outbursts of voice or extraordinary figures, but a vigorous and pitiless logic. Printing did not diminish their real value, while Danton's speeches lost by being read.

(Marie Marguerite Charlotte Robespierre (1760-1834). The *Mémoires* also exist in an edition by Hector Fleischnann, Paris, 1910.)

II. REMINISCENCES OF A SCHOOLMATE.

From a sketch by Fréron, in Martin, *Collection des papiers trouvés chez Robespierre*, I, 154-159:

At college Robespierre was what we have seen since, somber, choleric, morose, jealous of the successes of his comrades. Never did he mingle in their games; he walked apart, taking long strides, always a dreamer, of a sickly air. He had none of the qualities of childhood. His mobile countenance had already contracted those convulsive grimaces with which we are familiar. He was uncommunicative, not impulsive, without expansiveness, not frank, but he had a consuming self-love, an insurmountable obstinacy, and he was false at bottom. We did not recall seeing him laugh a single time. He cherished long the memory of an insult; he was vindictive and treacherous, knowing already how to dissimulate resentment.

He made good progress in his studies and gained prizes at the university. Earnest and persistent application to work was worth these first successes. . . .

Robespierre suffered from excess of bile. His eyes and his yellow tint showed it. At the Duplay's they were careful to serve to him at dessert, in all seasons of the year, a pyramid of oranges, which Robespierre devoured eagerly. It was always easy to distinguish the place he had occupied at table by the heaps of orange peel which covered his plate. One noticed that his countenance cleared up as he ate. . . .

The witty naïvetés which escaped Camille Desmoulins made Robespierre laugh until the tears came. But it was an immoderate and convulsive laughter. Then he relapsed into his usual black melancholy. . . .

(Louis Marie Stanislas Fréron (1754-1802); student at the Collège Louis-le-Grand with Robespierre and Camille Desmoulins; member of club of the Cordeliers; took part in insurrection of August 10; deputy of Paris to Convention; Montagnard; responsible for severities at Toulon after its recapture; upon return to Paris became enemy of Robespierre; Thermidorian and leader of "Jeunesse Dorée.")

III. IMPRESSIONS OF MME. ROLAND AND HER FRIENDS.

From the *Mémoires* of Mme. Roland, Perroud edition.

Notices Historiques, *Mémoires*, I, 65:

He then appeared to me a straightforward man; I

pardoned him his wretched diction and his wearisome delivery because of his principles. I nevertheless remarked that he was always absorbed at these committees;¹ he listened to all opinions, rarely expressed his own, or did not take the trouble to give reasons for it; and I have heard that the next day, the first at the tribune, he urged the reasons which the day before he had heard his friends express.

From Portrait of Brissot, in part of *Mémoires* called "Portraits. I, 203-4: "

The conduct of Robespierre, in conferences that took place at my house was remarkable. He spoke little, laughed (*ricanaît*) often, uttered sarcasms now and then, never expressed an opinion. But the next day after some especially detailed discussion he was careful to appear in the tribune of the Assembly and there take advantage of what he had heard his friends say. He was sometimes quietly reproached for this conduct, but he wriggled out by shuffling, and the ruse was understood as that of a man of devouring amour propre by which he was truly tortured. . . . Persuaded then that Robespierre loved liberty passionately, I was disposed to attribute such misdeeds to excess of zeal. I was disconcerted by a reserve, which seemed to announce either the fear of letting one's-self be penetrated because one is not good enough to know thoroughly or the distrust of a man who does not find in himself anything to add faith in the virtue of others, but I took this for timidity. . . . Never the smile of trustfulness was on Robespierre's lips, while they were almost always contracted by the bitter smile of an envy which wishes to seem disdainful. His talent, as orator, is below mediocre. His light voice, his wretched diction, his vicious manner of pronouncing, rendered his delivery very wearisome. But he defended his principles with warmth and obstinacy; he had the courage to continue to do so at a time when the number of the defenders of the people was prodigiously reduced. . . . I esteemed Robespierre on this account; I told him so; and even when he was not assiduous at the little committee, he came from time to time to ask to dine with me. I had been struck by the terror by which he appeared to be filled the day of the flight to Varennes; I found him that afternoon at Pétion's, where he said with disquietude that the royal family had not taken this step without having in Paris a coalition which would order a Saint Bartholomew of the patriots. . . .

In the Brissot Portrait also occurs a reference to Robespierre during the Champ de Mars crisis. Pp. 208-9:

We went to Buzot's house to say to him that without abandoning the Jacobins he would do well to enter the Feuillants, in order to keep track of what was going on there, and to be ready to defend those whom they were planning to persecute. Buzot hesitated some time. "I would do anything to save this unfortunate young man (referring to Robespierre), al-

though I am far from sharing the opinion of certain persons in regard to him. He thinks too much of himself to love liberty as much, but he serves it, and that is enough for me. . . . Grégoire has gone there, he will keep us informed of what is going on; indeed, they cannot undertake anything against Robespierre without action in the Assembly. There I shall be always ready to defend him."

Selections from the letters of Mme. Roland for comparison. May 12, 1791, to Bancal:

There is not on the left a single man of character, who unites to an ardent love of good that courageous firmness which rises against storms, braves them, and makes them subside. The best patriots seem more occupied with their own petty glory than with the major interests of their country, and, in truth, they are all mediocre men, even as regards talent. It is not mind that is lacking, but soul. Only that can elevate a man to a generous forgetfulness of self which sees only the good of all and thinks only of bringing it to pass without bothering about the means of assuring himself of the glory of it.

Correspondance, ed. Perroud, II, 276.

Similar letter to Champagneux on May 27. *Ibid.*, 284. July 18, 1791, to Bancal. Period of Champ de Mars affair:

A plot is being formed to denounce Robespierre to the Assembly, with the aim of having him sent to Orleans for trial. It might be possible between the multitude of his enemies and their vile agents to frame a charge which should dishonor and sacrifice the most vigorous defender of liberty. This manœuvre is actually being carried out, and the first threads have been stretched yesterday at the Feuillants.

Ibid., 339.

September 27, 1791. To Robespierre:

. . . Without having any important matter to tell you, I have faith that you would receive with interest news from the two beings whose soul is capable of appreciating you, and who love to express to you an esteem that they accord to few persons, an attachment that they have devoted only to those who place above everything else the glory of being just and the happiness of being persons of feeling. . . .

Ibid., 387.

April 25, 1792. After Robespierre's attack on the Girondins on April:

I have desired to see you, Sir, because, believing you to possess an ardent love for liberty, a complete devotion to the public welfare, I found the pleasure and the benefit in talking with you which good citizens feel in expressing their sentiments and clarifying their opinions. . . .

It is with sorrow that I have noted that you are persuaded that those who differ with you about the war are not good citizens.

I have not been guilty of the same injustice toward you; I know excellent citizens who have an opinion quite contrary to yours, but I have not found you less estimable for seeing otherwise than they. . . .

Ibid., 434.

¹ Mme. Roland arrived in Paris on February 20, 1791. Eventually a little circle of deputies and friends met at her house to discuss measures. The circle included Robespierre.

September 5, 1792. To Bancal:

We are under the knife of Robespierre and Marat; these persons are trying to excite the people and turn it against the Assembly and the Council. . . .

September 9, to same:

. . . My friend Dton has control of everything; Robp. is his mannequin, Mat holds his torch and his dagger. . . .

Ibid., 436.

On October 14, 1793, while in prison, Mme. Roland was ill and was visited by a physician upon the order of the authorities. The following dialogue she wrote as a part of a letter to Robespierre, but she did not send it. *Lettres*, Perroud ed., II, 522-3:

When he learned my name, he said he was a friend of a man whom, perhaps, I do not like. "What do you know about it, and who is he?" "Robespierre." "Robespierre! I have known him very well and esteemed him very much; I have believed him a sincere and ardent friend of liberty." "Eh! Is he not so any more?" "I fear that he also loves domination, perhaps with the idea that he knows better than any one what is good and wishes it more; I fear that he loves vengeance very much, and above all to exercise it against those who, he thinks, do not admire him; I think him very open to prejudice, easily angered in consequence, condemning too readily those who do not share his opinions." "You have not seen him twice." "I have seen him many more times than that! Ask him; let him put his hand upon his conscience, and you will see if he can speak ill of me."

(Jeanne Marie Philpon (1754-1793); married Roland de la Platière, in February, 1780; "salon" in Paris after February, 1791; Roland's first ministry, March-June, 1792; second ministry, August 10, 1792, to January 23, 1793; Mme. Roland tried before Revolutionary Tribunal, executed November 8, 1793.)

From *Mémoires of Buzot*, Part 2, pp. 93-94:

Robespierre, not less base and cowardly, coldly cruel with reflection, by system and by fear, hateful, vindictive, extremely jealous, had on his tongue without ceasing the words, "Providence" and "humanity," though he slew his oldest friends. This rascally hypocrite never pardoned the outrages he had inflicted, nor the benefits he had received, nor the talents he did not possess. Condorcet has said of him that he had not a single idea in his head nor a sentiment in his heart.

Page 163:

What can one imagine too cruel on the part of a wretch who has caused to perish on the scaffold his benefactors, M. and Mme. Rolland, who saved him after the affair of the Champs de Mars, who risked everything to find a shelter for his miserable life. . . . He trembled like a leaf shaken by the winds, and his petty soul was as incapable of braving danger as of devising a project useful to the liberty of his country.

(François Nicolas Buzot (1760-1794); advocate; deputy to States General from Evreux; president of criminal tribunal of Evreux; deputy to Convention from Evreux; Girondin; proscribed June 2; refugee near Bordeaux until

June, 1794; committed suicide when capture was imminent. *Memoirs* written while in hiding.)

From *Mémoires* of Barbaroux, p. 63 f.:

I was invited the next day to another conference at Robespierre's. I was struck with the ornaments of his chamber; it was a pretty boudoir, where his likeness was repeated under all forms and by all arts. He was painted on the wall at the right, engraved upon the left, his bust was at the end, and his bas-relief opposite; there were also half a dozen Robespierres in small engravings on the tables.

Just before August 10.

(Charles Jean Marie Barbaroux (1769-1794); advocate at Marseilles; secretary of commune of Marseilles; instrumental in dispatching battalion to Paris; deputy from Marseilles to Convention; Girondin, proscribed June 2, arrested near Bordeaux in June, 1794, and guillotined. *Memoirs* written while in hiding.)

Pétion, in an undelivered speech, printed in the *Moniteur*, November 10, 1792.

Speaking of the events of August 10, in connection with the Louvet-Robespierre controversy, he says they have given rise to the opinion that—

Intriguers had wished to gain control of the people, in order with its aid to seize authority. In this connection Robespierre has been singled out as guilty. His accusers have scrutinized his relationships and analyzed his conduct. They have mentioned words, which, they allege, have escaped one of these friends. Their conclusion is that Robespierre has had the mad ambition to become the dictator of his country.

The character of Robespierre explains what he has done. Robespierre is distrustful and very ready to take offense. He perceives on all sides plots, treasons, precipices. His choleric temperament, his splenetic imagination, present every object to him under somber colors. Domineering in his opinions, listening to his own conclusions alone, impatient of contradiction, never pardoning any one who has wounded his amour propre, and never acknowledging the wrongs he has done, he denounces men on the slightest pretext and becomes excited by the flimsiest suspicion. He has a fixed idea that others are occupied with his case and are planning to persecute him. He boasts of his own services and speaks of himself with little reserve. . . . He desires above all the favor of the people, pays court to it unceasingly and seeks with affectation its applause. This attitude, apparent in all his public life, has led some to think that Robespierre aspired to high destinies and that he wished to usurp dictatorial power.

As for me, I cannot persuade myself that this chimerical ambition has seriously occupied his thoughts, either as a desire or as an aim.

Moniteur, XIV, 430.

(Jerome Pétion de Villeneuve (1756-1794); advocate at Chartres; deputy to States General; chosen president Criminal Tribunal of Paris in June, 1791; elected mayor of Paris in November, 1791; deputy to Convention from Eure-et-Loir; Girondin; proscribed June 2; refugee with Buzot and Barbaroux; committed suicide when capture was imminent.)

IV. IMPRESSIONS OF A DISCIPLE, PHILLIPE BUONARROTI, AFTERWARDS ASSOCIATED WITH BABEUF.

From *Observations sur Maximilien Robespierre*. Edited by Charles Vellay in *Revue Historique de la Révolution Française*, III, 476-87. Supposed date—1833 to 1836. Printed in the *Radical*:

If we undertake to express our opinion upon this illustrious legislator, the reason is our belief that his public life offers instructive lessons to reformers and because the story of his misfortune throws much light upon the causes which prevented the establishment of the Republic in France. . . .

After naming geniuses like Lycurgus, Jesus, and Mahomet, who changed the face of the world, Buonarroti continues:

Such would have been Robespierre if there had been in the Convention fifty men capable of comprehending and seconding him. His manners were austere; he was temperate, disinterested, laborious, and well-disposed. These qualities rendered him dear to the persons who approached him. . . . In the Convention Robespierre had to combat the debris of royalty, the prejudices of the bourgeoisie, and the outbreaks of immorality. His constant thought was the reform of manners and the social order by the creation of institutions which would serve as a base for the majestic edifice of equality and of a republic of the people. . . . *People, Equality, Virtue*, were the great ideas to which he related all the duties of the legislator. . . .

Robespierre perceived in the vices and in the schemes of this factious leader (Danton) the last obstacle to be overcome in order to arrive at the peaceful triumph of equality and of the people. He resolved to combat it; he sealed his own death sentence. When honesty and virtue were put upon the order of the day, when immorality was declared counter-revolutionary, when from the tribune egoism and intrigue were proscribed, when corrupt deputies were haled before the tribunal which condemned traitors, the immoral factions grew pale and conceived atrocious projects. . . . If the revelation of some of Robespierre's proscribers may be believed, his apparent thought of modifying the laws upon property contributed not a little to swell the number of his enemies. . . . As to the Terror, he wished that it cease to weigh upon the people and that it should become more justly severe toward aristocrats and the immoral. . . .

(Philippe Buonarroti (1761-1837) descended from Michel Angelo; born at Pisa; obliged to leave Tuscany by reason of enthusiasm for Revolution; made a French citizen in May, 1793, imprisoned after fall of Robespierre; involved in conspiracy of Babeuf.)

V. RECOLLECTIONS OF MEMBERS OF THE CONVENTION.

From a defense of Billaud-Varenne, written in 1794 or 1795, first published in the *Revue Historique de la Révolution Française*. Vol. I, pp. 14 f.:

Is it forgotten . . . that from the time of the Constituent Assembly he enjoyed an immense popularity and that he had won the title of "incorruptible?" Is it forgotten that during the Legislative Assembly his

popularity increased, both through the journal which he edited and which had a wide circulation, and through his frequent speeches at the Jacobins? Is it forgotten that in the National Convention Robespierre was soon found to be the one who, as the center of attention, won so much confidence that he became the dominant figure, with the consequence that when he was chosen a member of the Committee of Public Safety he was the most important personage in France? If I should be asked how he had succeeded in gaining such an ascendancy over public opinion, I should reply that it was by displaying the most austere virtues, the most absolute devotion, the most unalloyed principles. . . .

As for us, reduced to the necessity of struggling in the silence of committees against the effects of an illusion that amounted to intoxication, it was a great deal doubtless not to have shared the illusion, it was a great deal to have opposed the force of inertia to a torrent that swept everything before it. . . .

I do not think that any one can blame a single person for failing to discover a conspiracy in Robespierre at an epoch when his conduct, far from offering anything reprehensible, attracted the confidence even of those who could not love him as a man, although they esteemed him as a patriot. Will it be denied that only from the time of the Law of 22 Prairial did he show perfidious intentions? . . .

(Jacques Nicolas Billaud-Varenne (1756-1819); prefect of studies in a college of the Oratorians at Paris; advocate at the parlement of Paris; ardent Revolutionary; deputy of Paris to Convention; Montagnard; member of Committee of Public Safety, September 6, 1793, to September 1, 1794; deported in 1795.)

From *Mémoires* of Bertrand Barère, II, 208-9:

I hasten to terminate this sad picture of civil dissension (9th Thermidor), leaving to history to draw the characteristic features of this Robespierre, who had virtues and vices in equal proportion. On the one hand, honesty, love of liberty, steadfastness in principles, love of poverty, devotion to the popular cause; on the other hand, a dangerous moroseness; a morbid rage against his enemies, an atrocious jealousy of talents which eclipsed his own, an insupportable mania of dominating others, an unbounded distrust, a sort of ferocious demagogism and a fanaticism of principles which led him to prefer the establishment of a law to the existence of a population.²

(Bertrand Barère de Vieuzac (1755-1841); advocate at parlement of Toulouse; deputy from Bigorre to States General; editor of *Point du Jour*; deputy to Convention from Hautes Pyrénées; member of Committee of Public Safety, April 6, 1793, to September 1, 1794; proscribed by the Thermidorians.)

From the *Mémoires* of Barras, I, 144-145, 151:

In revolutions there is no power greater than disinterestness and probity, because these qualities appeal to every interest and offer guarantees to all. . . . Every time a people is convinced of the integrity of a personage who steps forth to defend its cause

² A note refers to Robespierre's exclamation about the colonies.

the two seem bound by a compact that only death can end. Hence at this period of regeneration, which gained its impulse from feelings of indignation at the depravities of the old régime, the man whose manners and conduct were in strongest contrast to such odious corruption was bound to take a leading place in public opinion and could not fail to exert a great influence over the multitude.

Robespierre had thus attained a real dictatorship by reason of his reputation for incorruptibility and by what I may call his political immobility. His language, his manners, his costume had never varied. Always powdered when powder was proscribed; at the same time splenetic and somber; so he appeared at the States General, so he remained afterwards. Therefore naturally and, as it were, without noticing the situation himself he reached a degree of supremacy which made everybody tremble, and himself with the rest, alarmed at holding a power which he dared not abdicate.

In the following passage Barras gives an account of a call which, in company with Feron, he made upon Robespierre after the recapture of Toulon. This account describes the approaches to the Duplay residence, the ordinary inaccessibility of Robespierre, and the rude manner in which he treated his callers, continuing his toilet in their presence and not uttering a word.

That was our interview with Robespierre. I cannot call it a conversation, for he did not open his mouth; he merely pressed his lips together more tightly, and upon them I perceived a bilious froth which was disconcerting, to say no more. I had had enough. I had seen what since with much exactness has been called the *Tiger-Cat*.

(Count Paul François Nicolas Barras (1755-1829); a varied military career prior to his election to the Convention from the department of the Var; a Montagnard; Director, 1795-1799; retired to private life after 18th Brumaire. Memoirs begun in 1819, finally put together by literary executor, published only in 1895.)

From the *Mémoires* of Larevellière-Lépeaux, I, 114 f.:

What did I see upon entering (the salon)? Robespierre who had taken the posture of a master in the house, where he received homage such as is rendered to a divinity. The small chamber was especially devoted to him. His bust was framed there with different ornaments, verses, devices, etc. The salon itself was decorated with small busts in red or gray terra cotta, and furnished with portraits of the great man in crayon, in pastel, in water colors. He, well groomed and powdered, clad in a choice dressing gown, spread himself in an arm chair before a table loaded with fruit, fresh butter, pure milk, and fragrant coffee. All the family, father, mother and children, sought to divine in his eyes all his desires and to anticipate them instantly. The god deigned to smile upon me and held out his hand. The door of the salon was glass; the adorers, from the entrance on the court to this door, advanced slowly and respectfully; and entered the salon only when the sign of the head or of the hand of the divine man, perceived across the glass, gave them permission.

Apropos of a visit to the Duplay mansion in August (?), 1792.

(Louis Marie Larevellière-Lépeaux (1753-1824) attorney; deputy to States General from Angers; deputy to the Convention from Maine-et-Loire; proscribed with Girondins; Director, October, 1795-June, 1799. *Mémoires* written during Restoration.)

Mémoires of René Levasseur, based on his notes and papers; edited by Achille Roche and Fr. Levasseur.

Begins by referring to letter of Cadillac on Lyons and of Julien the Younger on Carrier:

The first two documents which I have cited prove completely, I think, that to Robespierre and to the part of the Committee of Public Safety and of the Mountain, which voted with him, should not be attributed the furies of certain proconsuls which have soiled the glorious history of the republic. . . .

Nevertheless, certain acts of severity have been the work of Robespierre and of his adherents. All were inflexible when they thought they saw the holy cause compromised. . . .

Robespierre and the Mountain, they say, stirred up excesses. How does it happen that they broke with the cheap and stupid demagogues of the Commune? How does it happen that they have adopted severe measures against a Vincent, a Ronsin, and so many other sanguinary monsters? How does it happen that at the head of the enemies who overthrew them appeared Callot d'Herbois, Billaud-Varenne, Carrier, and all the murderers, all the tigers with human faces of this sad but glorious epoch?

Levasseur refers to Robespierre's discourse on constitutional principles, delivered in 1793, as

. . . worthy of attention in more than one respect; full of republican energy, based on the truest principles, thoroughly democratic. It was also strong in its method of application, which is enough to prove that this man was not, as has been asserted since that time, a poor head. The love of the public weal made itself apparent in this speech, which was equally worth consulting for what it contained in favor of order and obedience to law, and for what it demanded in favor of liberty and equality.

I, 194; II, 210-11.

(René Levasseur (1747-1834); physician; deputy from the Sarthe to the Convention; Montagnard; arrested after insurrection of Germinal, an III.)

Mémoires of Choudieu, pp. 234-5:

His enemies have represented him to have been an ambitious man without talent. It is enough to read his different speeches to be convinced how superior he was to those who accused him, and who were able to conquer him only by assassinating him. I did not love Robespierre because he was not lovable, but that is not a reason to be unjust to him, or that I should join his enemies after he was dead. As to his ambition, it has never appeared to be clearly demonstrated and I have been able to discern in him throughout his career only a republican, too austere perhaps, but who wished sincerely the triumph of liberty. The only wrong that I laid to his charge was that of wishing, by means perhaps too violent, to subject all wills to

a single will, which was not his but that of the law. Possibly the laws were at that time too severe, but that is an inevitable misfortune in every revolution, which in order to finish more rapidly must beat down everything in its way. It is only by posterity that Robespierre will be fairly judged.

(Pierre René Choudieu (1761-1838); artillery officer; later deputy judge; deputy to Legislative Assembly from Marne-et-Loire; deputy to Convention from same; Montagnard; arrested after insurrection of Germinal, an III. Memoirs written about 1830.)

From *Mémoires* of Durand de Maillane, p. 14 f.:

... Robespierre, without being a member of the legislature (Legislative Assembly), had acquired by his triumph over the Feuillans and by his address to the French, a great renown throughout the kingdom, and a still greater credit in the mother society of the Jacobins at Paris. The new deputies had at the moment of their elections a very favorable opinion of him; and upon their arrival at Paris in seeing him on the throne of the Jacobins, they almost all rushed there, and so reinforced a power which was to be the shame and grief of France.

Robespierre, who had been made public prosecutor, had wished no place in order the more freely and with greater care to strengthen himself in this first popularity. ... Robespierre proposed ... to establish his control in this club. ... I have followed this man in all his career, and my assertion, overwhelmingly justified by the event, can serve the reader as a thread in the labyrinth for the matters which I am going to pass through. ...

Robespierre gained the upper hand without any one suspecting the secret ambition of this little man who without grace, without vigor in his eloquence, nevertheless enjoyed the greatest credit at the Jacobins after the rout of the Feuillans. ...

Page 34 f.:

As soon as we met in the Convention, quarrels began between all parties. For some time Robespierre had shown himself jealous of Pétion or of the glory which his mayoralty brought him, for his firm and disinterested administration of the office had won him the nickname of the Virtuous. ... One saw two parties arrayed against one another, both passionate friends of liberty. ... This put me in a painful embarrassment; but unable to remain hesitating, I did not hesitate to range myself beside Pétion. Robespierre perceived this and sent to my seat one of my friends, who was his zealous disciple, to tell me that if I believed the revolution finished, I was mistaken; that the surest party was that which had the greatest vigor and the most force against the enemies of liberty. ...

Page 253 apropos of this fall:

Under the Constituent Assembly his extreme opinions had won for him the attachment of the low class, and this attachment went to the extreme of fanaticism towards the end of the Legislative Assembly. His Address to the French, which, at any other time, would have been ridiculous, served him marvellously in the popular societies. Robespierre became then king of the clubs, and by their means soon became

master of the Convention itself. ... He took in the tribune the imperious attitude and the absolute tone of a man eternally under the aegis of his people. Also, unaccustomed to defeat, he lost his head the Ninth of Thermidor and succumbed from the moment that he was assailed.

(Pierre Toussaint Durand de Maillane (1729-1814); advocate at parlement of Aix; deputy from Arles to States General; deputy from Bouches-du-Rhône to Convention; judge under Consulate and Empire. Memoirs begun after 1798.)

From *Mémoires* of Meillan, p. 4:

Robespierre was simple in his manners. He affected hatred of display and contempt of riches. He appeared to be occupied only with the public welfare. All his speeches were interspersed with these imposing words: "Subsistence of the people, happiness of the people, power, sovereignty of the people." Maniac of equality, he desired it in every respect, in all forms, under all relationships and by every means. He appreciated no virtue save patriotism. ...

Robespierre had no superior talents. His eloquence was only a tissue of orderless declamations, without method, and, above all, without conclusion. We were obliged, every time he spoke, to ask him what he wished to come to. He complained, he lamented, he groaned without ceasing over the misfortunes of his country, and never had a remedy to propose. He cried out eternally against calumny and did not cease to calumniate. ...

I confess nevertheless that I have long doubted that he was ambitious. I have observed him closely, I have examined his speeches and his conduct. Not a word which did not breathe love of the public welfare, not an act which did not appear related to it. He had an air so simple and disinterested; he seemed so persuaded of the wisdom of his doctrine, that I have sometimes thought that he might be more unbalanced than ambitious, and that he aspired to govern France only because he held in good faith that she could be saved only by him. ...

(Armand Jean Meillan (1748-1809); deputy from Basses-Pyrénées to Convention; proscribed with Girondins; took refuge in the Pyrenees; restored to Convention on March 8, 1795. Memoirs written in 1795.)

From *Mémoires* of Thibaudeau, I, 58-59:

I had never said a single word to Robespierre; without speaking of his speeches and his actions, his person alone had something repulsive for me. He was of middle height, had a thin face and cold expression, a sallow complexion, an evasive glance, short and affected manners, a dogmatic and imperious tone, a forced and sardonic laugh. Although chief of the sans-coulottes, he was carefully dressed, and used powder, after everybody else had given it up. Rather uncommunicative, he kept at a distance the persons with whom he was most intimate; he was sort of pontiff with his disciples and devotees, and one whose pride was gratified by the worship which they manifested toward him.

(Antoine Clair Thibaudeau (1765-1854); advocate; deputy to Convention from Vienne; Montagnard; distin-

guished official under Consulate and Empire, made Count under Empire; author of important histories of the period. These Memoirs written after 1815.)

VI. TWO OFFICIALS.

Mémoires sur la Révolution ou Exposé de ma Conduite dans les Affaires et dans les Fonctions Publiques. By D. J. Garat. Paris, L'An III, pp. 50 f.

Opens by a comparison with Salles:

Both men I believed to be sincerely attached to the Revolution. I believed in the honesty of both, not in the sense that they were always right, but that they wished and believed they were doing right. If I had been able to entertain doubts upon the honesty and patriotism of either, . . . I should have doubted Salles rather than Robespierre.

In Robespierre, beyond the verbose platitudes of his daily improvisations, beyond his eternal reiterations upon the rights of man, the sovereignty of the people, principles upon which he spoke unceasingly, and upon which he never developed a view either exact or fresh, I thought I perceived, above all when he printed, the germs of a talent which could grow, which really did grow, and whose full development might one day do much good or much harm. I noted that in his style he was anxious to imitate those forms of language which have elegance, nobility, and éclat. According to the forms even that he imitated and that he reproduced most often, it was easy for me to divine that all his studies were based on Rousseau. . . .

But in Salles and in Robespierre I had most distinctly noted that mental falsity so common in those who treat great questions, and which can become fatal in those who treat great political questions.

The sentiment which appeared most in Robespierre, and of which he made no mystery . . . and which had won him with certain Paris groups the title of the *Incorruptible*; this sentiment is that the defender of the people can never be wrong; that he betrays the people if he puts any limit or any measure in his principles; that everything which the people does, and in all one says for it, everything is virtue and truth, nothing can be excess, error, and crime. . . .

In Robespierre and in Salles dominated a morbid temperament, which plagues those who have it and which is the origin of all the tempests which have overturned the moral world. . . . Never was a man who knew how to write elegant phrases more foreign to logic. For him the best reasons were his suspicions. One day I asked him to reflect upon some ideas that I presented to him, and which would have spared him all the crimes, which have erected so many scaffolds besides his own. His reply was, "*I do not need to reflect, I always rely upon my first impressions.*" . . .

Same, *Mémoires Historiques sur le Dix-huitième Siècle*, 1821, II, 538-9.

Speaking of the Convention—

In this extraordinary number of orators always ready and always environed by wars with Europe, by revolutionary tribunals, and by scaffolds which trickled with blood, a single individual seeks curiously and laboriously for the forms and the elegant expressions of style; he writes most often having near

him half open the romance where breathe in enchanting language the tenderest passions of the heart, and are displayed the sweetest pictures of nature, LA NOUVELLE HELOISE; and this is the orator whom his French colleagues have most constantly accused of having erected the most scaffolds and shed the most blood; it is Robespierre.

While priests are bearing to the national tribune profession of faith in atheism, and other priests are confessing there, at the peril of their lives, the God and faith of the Gospels, this same Robespierre causes to be erected an altar and to be consecrated a festival to the God whom nature, and not men, reveals to the Eternal; and the discourse that he pronounces, as high priest of this festival and of this altar, appears so beautiful, so religious, so pathetic, to one of the most illustrious dispensers of the crowns due to the first literary talents, to La Harpe, that he addresses to him enthusiastically a letter eloquent in itself, and in which more eulogies are lavished than were ever lavished upon the author of the eulogies of the dauphin and of Marcus Aurelius.

Robespierre, whom Europe thinks it sees at the head of the French nation, lives in the shop of a carpenter whose son he aspires to become; and his morals are not only decent; without any affectation or any hypocritical watchfulness over himself, they are as severe as the morality of the God brought up at the house of the carpenter of Judea.

(Dominique Joseph Garat (1794-1833) collaborated in *Encyclopédia Méthodique*; professor of History at the Lycée, 1786; deputy from Ustaritz to States General; Minister of Justice, October, 1792-March, 1793; Minister of the Interior, March, 1793-August 15, 1793; owed safety during Terror to Barère and Robespierre; later Senator and Count of the Empire.)

Mémoires of Miot de Melito. Pages 27-8:

I have still to speak of Robespierre. I saw him . . . once only. Elegant in dress, carefully curled and powdered, composed in manner, he formed the most curious contrast with the disorder, affected neglect and coarseness that appeared in the attire and manners of his colleagues. His deportment was grave, and he took hardly any part in the conversation, speaking only now and then a few sententious words. But notwithstanding the immobility of his pale and sinister countenance, it was evident that he did not feel at his ease, and I learned afterwards that he owed a grudge to Deforgues for having thrown him into the company of men whom he pretended to regard as very uncertain patriots, or what was more criminal still in his eyes, as "Moderates." I also thought I could perceive by the few words uttered by Robespierre that he especially desired to be distinguished as a great statesman.

The occasion was dinner parties at the house of Deforgues between June, 1793, and the end of the year. Other guests were Danton, Fabre d'Eglantine, Legendre, etc.

(André François Miot (1762-1841); "Chef de Bureau" in War Department; later Secretary General of Ministry of Foreign Affairs under Deforgues; still later diplomat and minister under King Joseph, and Count of Melito. Memoirs based upon notes alleged to be contemporary.)

VII. A SCENE IN THE JACOBIN CLUB IN 1794.

The scene is dated just before the overthrow of Hébert during the debate between Hébert and Robespierre. Written by Joseph Fiévée. *Journées Révolutionnaires*, I, 156:

Robespierre came forward slowly. At this period he was almost the only one to preserve the costume and the manner of dressing the hair which were customary before the Revolution. Short and thin, he bore a fairly strong resemblance to a tailor of the old régime. He wore spectacles, either because he needed them, or because they hid the twitching of an austere countenance, which was without natural dignity. His delivery was slow, and his phrases were so long that each time he paused, raising his spectacles to his forehead, the natural inference was that he had concluded. But, after looking about over his audience, he lowered his spectacles, and added several clauses to the already long period.

I did not understand what he was talking about, if not that in political parties, as in religion, there is a mysticism which escapes the intelligence of those who are strangers to it. Besides, my ears had begun to throb. He was no longer greeted by applause, as was Père Duchesne, but by sobs, cries, and stamping enough to make the hall fall in. My acolyte and I were stupefied by it, not daring to make a motion, especially because we perceived that our unresponsiveness attracted the attention of our neighbors, and that they had already begun to murmur. With a glance at one another we agreed to slip out. We were near the door and hurried away.

(Joseph Fiévée (1767-1834); famous journalist; official under Empire.)

VIII. IMPRESSIONS OF THREE WOMEN.

From Mme. de Staël's *Considérations sur la Révolution Française*, II, 140-142:

Of this epoch no name save Robespierre's will endure. He was, nevertheless, neither more able nor more eloquent than the others; but his political fanaticism had a character of calmness and austerity which made him feared by all his colleagues.

I have talked with him once at my father's house in 1789, when he was known as an Artois lawyer, with exaggerated democratic principles. His features were commonplace, his color pale, his veins of a greenish tinge; he supported the most absurd assertions with a coolness that had an air of conviction; and I could well believe that, at the beginning of the Revolution, he had adopted upon equality of property as well as of rank certain ideas culled from his reading, with which his envious and evil character armed itself gladly. . . .

There was something mysterious in his make-up, which added a new terror to the terror which the government openly announced. Never did he adopt the ordinary means of popularity of the period; he was not badly dressed; on the contrary, he was the only one who powdered his hair; his clothes were in scrupulous order, and his countenance had nothing of the rudely familiar. . . . One wished something ab-

stract in authority, in order that everybody should seem to share it. Robespierre had acquired the reputation of a lofty democratic virtue, he was believed incapable of personal views; from the moment that he was suspected of them his power was shaken.

(Anne Louise Germaine Necker (1766-1817); daughter of the famous banker and Minister of Finances; married Baron de Staël-Holstein in 1786, who became Swedish ambassador to France; remained in Paris until immediately before the Massacres of September.)

From the *Journal d'une Bourgeoise pendant la Révolution*. By Mme. Julien de la Drôme. Selection written February 10, 1793, after the Robespierres had dined with her:

I have been much pleased with the Robespierre family. The sister is naïve and unassuming like thy (M. Julien de la Drôme) aunts. She came two hours before her brothers and we talked as two women would. I led her to speak of their ways of living. It is quite as with us, simplicity and freedom. Her brother had no share in the affair of August 10 nor in that of September 2. He is as suited to be a party leader as to take the moon between his teeth. He is an abstract thinker, rather dry like a student; but he is as gentle as a lamb and somber like Young.

I see that he has not our tender sensibility, but I incline to think that he desires the well being of mankind for the sake of justice rather than for sentiment.

In short, it is only necessary to look into his face to conclude that nature never gave such gentle lines except to a fine soul.

The younger Robespierre is quicker, more frank, and excellent patriot. His mind is commonplace and his humor petulant, and this creates an unfavorable impression.

From the *Letters* of Helen Maria Williams, containing a Sketch of the Politics of France, from the thirty-first of May, 1793, to the twenty-eighth of July, 1794. Second edition, London, 1796. Vol. I, 194-195, 228-229:

It is remarkable enough, that at this period Robespierre always appeared not only dressed with neatness, but with some degree of elegance, and, while he called himself the leader of the sans-culottes, never adopted the costume of his band. His hideous countenance, far from being involved in a black wig, was decorated with hair carefully arranged, and nicely powdered; while he endeavored to hide those emotions of his inhuman soul which his eyes sometimes might have betrayed, beneath a large pair of green spectacles, though he had no defect in his sight.

That class of men who were peculiarly the object of the tyrant's rage were men of letters, with respect to whom the jealousy of the rival mingled with the fury of the oppressor, and against whom his hatred was less implacable for having opposed his tyranny, than for having eclipsed his eloquence. . . . Robespierre, for the misfortune of humanity, was persecuted by the most restless desire of distinguishing himself as an orator, and nature had denied him the power. . . .

Helen Maria Williams (1762-1807); resided in France almost continuously after 1788; well known writer.

IX. RECOLLECTIONS OF SEVERAL FOREIGNERS.

From the Correspondence of William Augustus Miles on the French Revolution, I, 245.

On March 1, 1791, Miles wrote to H. J. Pye, poet laureate:

The man held of least account in the national assembly by Mirabeau, by Lafayette, and even by the Lameths and all the Orleans faction, will soon be of the first consideration. He is cool, measured, and resolved. He is in his heart a republican, honestly so, not to pay court to the multitude, but from an opinion that it is the very best, if not the only, form of government which men ought to admit. Upon this principle he acts, and the public voice is decidedly in favor of this system. He is a stern man, rigid in his principles, plain, unaffected in his manner, no foppery in his dress, certainly above corruption, despising wealth, and with nothing of the volatility of a Frenchman in his character. I do not enter into the forms of government, but I say Robespierre is a *bona fide* republican, and that nothing which the king could bestow upon him, were his majesty in a position to bestow anything, could warp this man from his purpose. . . . I watch him very closely every night. I read his countenance with eyes steadily fixed upon him. He is really a character to be contemplated; he is growing every hour into consequence, and, strange to relate, the whole national assembly hold him cheap, consider him as insignificant, and, when I mentioned to some of them my suspicions, and said he would be a man of sway in a short time, and govern the million, I was laughed at.

(William Augustus Miles (1753-1817), English political writer, agent of the British ministry in France, 1790-1791.)

From *Recollections* of Etienne Dumont, Lady Seymour edition, p. 46:

I had only two conversations with Robespierre; he had a sinister appearance and never looked anyone in the face; he had a nervous twitch in his eyes that was continuous and painful. Once when there was a question relating to Genevese affairs, he asked me for some explanations, and I pressed him to speak on the subject. He told me that he was as shy as a child, that he always shook with fear on approaching the Tribune, and that he was hardly conscious of his surroundings when he began to speak.

(Pierre Etienne Louis Dumont (1759-1829); distinguished Swiss Protestant preacher; closely associated with Mirabeau during early Revolution; later went to England, friend of Fox and Bentham. Memoirs written after 1816.)

From Johann Friedrich Reichardt, *Un Prussien en France en 1792*. Lettres, intimes, traduites par A. Laquante, p. 316. March 18, 1792. Sitting of the Jacobin Club:

Robespierre showed himself at this sitting, but did not utter a word. I have been struck by his impermanent manner. When he entered, after he had flung himself with a haughty air upon a chair apart, near the door, he remained motionless, his legs crossed, his carefully groomed head thrown back. He did not take the least part in the debates, and seemed to be

there only because he made use of the clubbists and because he wished to see if any incident came up which concerned him. His countenance, his pale complexion, his sneaking glances, made his attitude still more provoking.

(J. F. Reichardt (1752-1814); German musician and composer, appointed "Kapellmeister" by Frederick the Great; travelled extensively.)

From a *Journal during a residence in France from the beginning of August to the Middle of December, 1792*. By John Moore, M.D. London, 1793.

Under date of September 4:

The popular Robespierre, who was a member of the Constituent Assembly, and it is thought will be one of the very first elected for the convention, belongs also to this general council of the Commune of Paris.

As he has been considered as the leading member of the Jacobin Society, and is distinguished by his great popularity, it surprised many when he offered to become a member of the Commune of Paris, and it impressed an idea that this body intended to assume the exercise of more important functions than ever.

But he was not heard from on the 10th of August, nor did he present himself to the Conseil-général de commune till two or three days after—for although he is a patriot of the first eminence, and a most undaunted haranguer and disputant in popular assemblies, yet he is thought rather to be inclined to shun such contests as that which was carried on in the square of the Carousel on the 10th of August.

In person Robespierre is certainly not an Ajax, although he is thought to agree with that hero in one sentiment,

Tutius est fictis igitur contendere verbis,
Quam pugnare manu.

Few men however can look fiercer than Robespierre; in countenance he has a striking resemblance to a cat-tiger.

I, 336-8.

Under date of October 26:

Robespierre is a man of small size, and a disagreeable countenance, which announces more fire than understanding; in his calmest moments, he conceals with difficulty the hatred and malignity which is said to exist in his heart, and which his features are admirably formed to express. He distinguished himself in the Constituent Assembly by the violence of his speeches, and much more since, in the Jacobin Society, by the violence of his measures. His eloquence is employed in invectives against tyrants and aristocrats, and in declamations in praise of Liberty. His speeches are barren in argument, but sometimes fertile in flowers of fancy.

Robespierre is considered as an enthusiast rather than a hypocrite; some people thing him both, which is not without example; but, to me, he seems to be too much of the first to be a great deal of the second. He has always refused every office of emolument; his passion is popularity, not avarice; and he is allowed, even by those who detest many parts of his character, and are his enemies, to be incorruptible by money.

II, 239-40.

Under date of November 3 Moore wrote apropos of the attack upon Robespierre as aspiring to a dictatorship:

Robespierre . . . continued to speak of himself a considerable time in the most flattering terms.

. . . What is peculiar to Robespierre is, that he seems as much enlivened by the eulogies he bestows on himself, as others are by the applause of their fellow-citizens.

The panegyric he pronounced on his own virtues evidently raised his spirits and inspired him with a courage which at last precipitated him into rashness. "A system of calumny is established," said he with a lofty voice, "and against whom is it directed? Against a zealous patriot. Yet who is there among you dare rise and accuse me to my face?"

"Moi," exclaimed a voice from one end of the hall. There was a profound silence; in the midst of which, a thin, lank, pale-faced man stalked along the hall like a spectre; and being come directly opposite to the tribune, he fixed Robespierre, and said, "Oui, Robespierre, c'est moi qui t'accuse."

It was Jean-Baptiste Louvet.

Robespierre was confounded; he stood motionless, and turned pale; he could not have seemed more alarmed had a bleeding head spoken to him from a charger.

Louvet ascended, and appeared in front of the tribune, while Robespierre shrunk to one side.

Danton perceiving how much his friend was disconcerted, called out, "Continue, Robespierre, there are many good citizens here to hear you."

This seemed to be a hint to the people in the galleries, that they might show themselves in support of the patriot, but they remained neutral.

On November 8, when Robespierre made his reply, the galleries were crowded at an early hour.

Immediately before Robespierre ascended the tribune, a deputy complained that the galleries were unfairly filled; that certain privileged persons, chiefly women, had been introduced for the purpose of applauding, while all the impartial citizens were kept out; "Des citoyennes," he exclaimed, "sont à la porte des tribunes que d'autres porteuses de cartes privilégiées font facilement entrées."

This observation occasioned a universal laugh, and everybody turned their eyes to the galleries, which were almost entirely filled with women. Robespierre's eloquence is said to be peculiarly admired by the sex; and it has been remarked, that on the nights when he was expected to speak at the Jacobins the proportion of females in the galleries was always greater than usual.

When Robespierre appeared in the tribune, it was evident that he had entirely recovered his spirits, and he certainly made a much better figure than he did when he was last there.

II, 298 f.

Moore quoted from the *Chronique de Paris*, edited by Condorcet, the number of November 9, the following:

It is sometimes asked, how it happens that such numbers of women are continually attending Robespierre wherever he is, at his own house, at the gal-

leries of the Jacobins, of the Cordeliers, and of the Convention?

It is because the French Revolution is considered as a religion, of which Robespierre is the leader of a sect. He is a priest who has devotees, but it is evident that all his power is EN QUENOUILLE.³ Robespierre preaches, Robespierre censures; he is furious, grave, melancholic, affectedly exalted, consistent in his opinions and in his conduct; he thunders against the rich and the great; he lives on little, is moderate in his natural appetites; his chief mission is to speak, and he speaks continually. . . . Robespierre is a priest, and can never be anything more.

John Moore (1729-1802); distinguished English physician, traveler, and writer.

Marie Jean Antoine Nicolas Caritat, Marquis de Condorcet (1743-1794); philosopher already distinguished before Revolution; deputy from Paris to Legislative Assembly; deputy from Aisne to Convention; proscribed for denouncing arrest of Girondins; died immediately after arrest in April, 1794.

Gouverneur Morris. *Life and Writings*. Letter to George Washington, April 10, 1794. Vol. II, 418-419:

The fall of Danton seems to terminate the idea of a Triumvirate. The chief, who would in such case have been one of his colleagues, has wisely put out of the way a dangerous competitor. Hence it would seem that the high road must be laid through the Comité de Salut Public; unless indeed, the army should meddle. . . . It is a wonderful thing, Sir, that four years of convulsion . . . has brought forth no one, either in civil or military life, whose head would fit the cap which fortune has woven.

Robespierre has been the most consistent if not the only consistent. He is one of those of whom Shakespeare's Cæsar speaks to his frolicsome companion, "He loves no sports as thou dost, Anthony." There is no imputation against him for corruption. He is far from rich, and still farther from appearing so. It is said that his idol is ambition; but I think that the establishment of the Republic would, all things considered, be most suitable to him. Whether he thinks so is another question, which I will not pretend to answer, nor how far such establishment may appear to him practicable. . . .

QUESTIONS AND PROBLEMS.

I.

1. Make three lists of authors of selections: (a) writers favorable to Robespierre; (b) writers markedly hostile; (c) writers who made an apparent effort to be objective in their treatment. Note circumstances, party connection, social position, etc., common to any members of same group.

2. List selections written during Revolutionary period, up to 1796. Note conditions which differentiate their value from that of later memoirs.

3. To what extent do writers of different groups agree upon elements of Robespierre's personality?

³ This expression, Moore explains, is "used in the ancient French chronicles relative to the succession to the crown, to declare that women are excluded, *La couronne en France ne tombe jamais en Quenouille*."

4. Mention unfavorable judgments which seem to be accounted for upon grounds of political prejudice.

5. Is any light thrown on the value of the Duperron physical portrait by the fact of its repetition at the head of other contemporary libels?

6. Who mentions first the likeness of Robespierre's face to that of a cat?

7. Is any marked difference to be noted between what is said in Mme. Roland's Memoirs and in her Letters?

8. Is there any probable relation between the description that Babaroux gives and that given by Larevellière-Lépeaux?

9. What weight do time and circumstance give to Pétion's remarks? Why do characterizations given by Billaud-Varenne during the Thermidorian period have special point?

10. Is it possible to tell from Dr. John Moore's remarks which political group influenced him, at least to some extent?

II.

List statements on the following elements of personality, distinguishing those (a) supported by ample evidence, and those (b) which are more doubtful.

1. Physical characteristics, height, countenance, complexion, etc.
2. Dress, gait, bearing.
3. Habits.
4. Manner toward others.
5. Characteristics as a speaker.
6. Style as an orator.
7. Intellectual powers, range, creativeness, cogency of argumentation.
8. Moral characteristics.
9. Political aims.
10. Nature of influence or rôle.

III.

Write a sketch of Robespierre based upon impressions critically sifted and valued.

The Socialized Recitation

BY BESSIE L. PIERCE, UNIVERSITY HIGH SCHOOL, IOWA CITY, IOWA.

Recently the history recitation has come to mean not merely a vehicle for testing the knowledge of pupils, but one through which there will be a development of certain social attributes necessary for the efficient member of a community. Hence, much more attention than formerly is being paid to methods of presenting subject matter. Definite conclusions, through a consensus of opinion and through data from various method experiments, are attained with difficulty, due to the variability in conditions of the human element (the teacher and the pupil). However, it is generally agreed that the old question and answer method, in which there was an emphasis upon teacher-activity and a tendency toward pupil-passivity, is not the best plan to cultivate the social instinct of the pupil. In this plan the stressing of teacher-participation generally produces a lack of interest in the pupil, slight absorption of the subject-matter, restlessness, and certainly very little development of a responsibility of each member of the class toward the group as a whole. Because of its social content, history and its kin in the social sciences should be taught in the manner most productive of social development. According to Inglis, the values of history are of two kinds:¹

1. Direct and Specific Values.
2. Indirect and General Values.

Direct and specific include direct social civic values, direct vocational values, direct avocational values, direct propædæutic values. Indirect and general values are those values derived from the study of history for the development of certain general social concepts, and those arising from the training of certain valuable mental traits and their transference to non-historical material.

"To conceive that the direct social-civic values of

history are to be measured solely by the extent to which one may consciously employ certain facts or pieces of information concerning a historical event in solving a problem of the present," says Inglis, "is to have a very superficial view of the function of historical study. The direct application of a knowledge of historical events to present-day problems is, of course, a very real result of the study of history. Much more important, however, than acquired *knowledge* in the field of history are the less tangible but none the less real *attitudes* developed through the study of that subject."

To develop these "real attitudes," or indirect values, as well as to develop the direct values of history, a form of class-expression which brings into play all of the alertness and mental vigor of the child at every moment of the recitation hour needs to be followed. The socialized method is an attempt to accomplish this.

What, then, should be the qualities of the socialized work which will distinguish it from the usual "pounding-in-of-information" plan? In the first place, each pupil should be made to feel his responsibility for the conduct of the class during the whole recitation hour. Here is found the development of the community instinct as distinguished from an individualistic attitude. The pupil should feel himself an integral part of the group, should feel that it is his duty as well as his privilege to contribute to the fullest of his capacity, and to use his influence to lead others to do likewise. He should be trained to assume the part of critic, but only in the spirit of good-will. In the second place, there should be a development of self-expression and of individuality through the necessity of active participation for each person. Third, the work should be so organized in the lesson assignment that the time lost in questioning in the ordinary recitation can be spent in class discussion. In the

¹ Inglis, "Principles of Secondary Education," 547 ff.

fourth place. the work should be so assigned that there will not be a departure from the work in hand.

Various forms of socialization have been tried by different teachers. The most common type is seen in the selection of a leader from the class membership who shall conduct the work. In other words, this leader is to serve as the teacher, questioning the students, acting as arbiter in disputes, serving as critic, and even, in some instances, assuming the role of disciplinarian. When this is done, some teachers feel that the class has become "socialized." However, it is to be debated whether this plan in itself makes for socialization; whether the elimination of the teacher is the chief requisite for the most highly socialized work. Can not the teacher play an important, though perhaps silent part, in the direction of the work? It would seem that the process of socialization is not necessarily effected simply by the elimination of the teacher and the selection of a pupil to carry out the ordinary functions of the teacher, but by other qualities of the recitation conduct. Whatever the outward form of the socialization, it is the end attained which finally determines the efficacy of any plan. The writer has tried various plans, and found that in all, certain features of success were common, and that all had the same defects. If the class is taken into the confidence of the teacher, and the scheme is explained carefully and thoroughly, the average high school class will co-operate irrespective of the length of time in which they have been taught by other methods. The organization should be such that the machinery should be simple and should work as though well oiled, but never in a mechanical manner. This can be accomplished whether by a leader from the class plan or by the pupils' recognition from the teacher as the leader.

Charges against extreme socialization have been made with justice by its critics. Some socialized work leads to incessant talking by the pupils, to a disruptive attitude, to a tendency to wander from the subject matter, to unnecessary noises, and to a monopoly of the recitation by the good pupils. These defects are much more common in the socialized plan where the teacher gives the reins entirely into the hands of a leader from the group than in one in which she exercises the function of the leader, but not in the domineering manner of the average teacher-questioner.

The plan which the writer has found most productive of good has been to seat the class in such a manner that the pupils face each other, two rows having their backs to the teacher's desk, and facing two other rows. This tends to make the pupils talk to each other and not to recite to the teacher only. Great care is taken in giving the assignments, first, in order that questions by the teacher, except for settling disputed points or clearing up mistakes, may be eliminated, and second, that it may serve as an outline from which the pupil may carry on his recitation. The class is directed to ask questions over doubtful points, to demand explanations for statements, to

criticise, and to amplify statements. Occasionally the teacher has not asked a question throughout the hour, but at other times she has found it necessary to emphasize certain phases of the work. She usually sits at her desk, directing back of the class, taking very little part except to call upon pupils for contributions, yet an intangible compulsion and unseen stimulus, as well as a trusted guide, seem to cause many of the defects charged to some socialized plans to disappear in this scheme. To cultivate a healthy rivalry, an alphabetical division of the class into two groups for the purpose of checking each other on recitations is made. Each group selects a leader who keeps account of the number of recitations made each week by each individual of the class, and the report is posted on Friday, although the grade for the work done is determined by the teacher. The publicity of the number of recitations made by individuals, as well as the rivalry of the groups, aids in keeping the class alert and anxious to recite.

The following table represents the participation in minutes of the pupils in a class of twenty-five for a week, the actual period of recitation approximating thirty minutes daily. It is almost trite to remark about the amount of time consumed by the teacher where the question method is pursued, yet it may not be amiss to call attention to the fact that only an average of three minutes was taken by the teacher in the time of reciting, or spent in some other way in this record of the socialized work, although the class covered the assignments intelligently and thoroughly, passing commendable written tests later on them.²

TABLE.

	Time of recitations by minutes or fraction thereof	Average time reciting	Number recitations made	Number different pupils reciting	Time taken by teacher in remarks	Number failing to recite but called upon
Monday	30	1 1-5	24	20	2 min.	3
Tuesday	28	1 1-6	24	19	2 min.	1
Wed.	34	2	17—2 abs.	11	3 min.	1
Thur.	29	1 1-3	22—1 abs.	15	3 min.	0
Friday	30	2	15—1 abs.	12	4 min.	1

Perhaps no discussion can better prove the effectiveness of the socialized recitation over the old question and answer plan than by contrasting two stenographic reports of work in the same school. Both classes were accustomed to a socialized method, yet one teacher, new in the school, felt that he must control the work visibly, and that he could not get information from the pupils without frequent questions.

² This time does not include the assignment of lessons.

STENOGRAPHIC REPORT: QUESTION AND ANSWER METHOD.

T. To-day our lesson discusses emigration to America. Can you tell me something about that in regard to land, etc., Clarence?

P. Don't know anything about that.

T. Don't know anything about that, and it is the first thing in our lesson?

P. Made land more valuable.

T. Anything to add, Louis?

P. They had heard stories about gold and silver, and they were afraid their children would be kidnapped.

P. They told tales of wonderful riches, gold chains and silver plates, ornaments of gold and silver, and wonderful things they could find, so they started to emigrate fast. They found many things to be untrue, so many others did not come. They advertised in the papers, sent hand-bills, some ship-owners tried to get rich. They charged three hundred to five hundred dollars for each passenger. They made offices at the ports. They tried to make people go. They would show a few things at port which they had found. They said there was plenty of land.

P. Afterwards they didn't believe the stories about the gold, and they came to get land.

T. How about to-day? Do real estate agents use the same practices? Did you ever read one of their ads in the paper about land? How they make it sound one thing, when it is not really true? How much did it cost to make the trip?

P. About two or three hundred dollars.

All. Aw—three to five hundred.

T. Tell about religious causes. What about the Puritans? How about the different denominations or religions? Tell about their character and life.

P. When they came over here, they had to go to church, they were punished if they didn't, their hands and feet were tied, the boys were whipped, they had to think of death and go to church regular, and they thought it was wicked to go to see a show.

T. Where did they settle?

P. Massachusetts.

T. Show me on the map where Massachusetts is. (Pupil shows on map location of Massachusetts.) Yes.

T. Do you remember some descendants of these people? The names of any prominent persons?

P. Some writers and historians, Longfellow, Bryant. Don't remember any others.

T. We will come to some of them later. Henry Wadsworth Longfellow, John Adams, Hancock, who took part in the Revolution. What about the Quakers? What kind of people were they, and who were they?

P. They came with Penn, and didn't they settle in Massachusetts? (Pause.)

T. Go ahead.

P. They came over here to have their own church.

T. Where did they settle?

P. In Pennsylvania. They were more tolerant than others.

T. Yes, they were more tolerant. They permitted more participation in government. Do you remember the book said something about the Dunkards? Who remembers what the book said about the Dunkards? (Pause.) Didn't anybody look that up? (Pause.) They were a sect who came over from Germany. There were Lutherans also and the Baptists in Pennsylvania. How about the Presbyterians in Scotland and Ireland?

P. Some of these religious people came from Ireland to New York, but stayed there; later the Scots came to Ireland, and then there was religious feeling against the two religions.

T. Anything to add to the Scotch-Irish?

P. In Ireland a general there was very cruel, and drove the Scots out of Ireland. In this way the Scots settled where they were driven out and came to America.

T. What famous general was that?

P. Cromwell.

T. Yes Cromwell. He was the leader of the Puritans in England. When the Puritans became the leaders Cromwell led a faction against the royalists or cavaliers. They emigrated about 1650. Later the English government was almost as severe to them as they had been to the Catholics and they left England and settled in Scotland and Pennsylvania in order to have a place to worship. The book said about one-sixth at the outbreak of the Revolution were of Scotch-Irish descent.

P. A bunch of people went to England and settled there but were crowded out.

T. Anything else about the Scotch-Irish? In Ireland to-day the Scotch Presbyterian element in the north has caused trouble of Home Rule. Tell me something of the Catholics in America.

P. Don't know anything about that.

T. Who was the leader?

P. Lord Baltimore.

T. Tell me about him.

P. Well all I know is that the king gave him land in America. He went there and called it Maryland. It did not have any religion but most were Catholics. He laid out the city of Baltimore.

T. Show me the city of Baltimore on the map. (Pupil points out city on the map.) What famous provision did Lord Baltimore make in regard to religion?

P. Anyone who believed in Christ could live there.

T. Who was excluded?

P. Jews.³

T. Yes the Jews. The book mentioned the Royalists or Cavaliers. Who were they?

P. They were proprietors who owned tracts of land and got people to settle on them.

T. Who were the Cavaliers?

P. They were supporters of the king when Cromwell drove the king out and beheaded him. They came to America and settled in Virginia. They feared the king.

³ At this point fifteen minutes of the class hour was gone.

T. Yes, they feared the king and they came to America and settled in Virginia. What famous Cavalier came over here?

P. George Washington's ancestors.

T. The really noble class of England were the Cavaliers. Another cause of emigration was poverty. Tell me something about that.

P. The better class in America had bond servants and got land and started anew and had more chance.

T. Do you remember about how many came over for religion or poverty?

P. More came over on account of poverty than religion.

T. General cause or reason don't you think? How about to-day? Do people come here because of their religion or to better their condition? Many came from religious principles. Thrown in prison for minor things, the burden was on the poor. The peasants had a hard time. What about kidnapping of people etc.?

P. They kidnapped people of the poorer class and sold them as slaves; they had to work barefoot; they had no clothes and not anything to eat. They kidnapped them on the streets at night.

P. They lay for them at night. They had to work like slaves, both the women and children had to work as hard as men and they had no shelter.

P. It said in the book they carried off about 10,000 a year.

T. Yes, about 10,000 in one year. Anything else?

P. Men, women, boys and girls of all ages were kidnapped.

T. Yes, men, women were kidnapped and some were sold to landowners. The men were bound out as servants. We'll read about it later. Did you notice anything in the book about the Mennonites? Didn't anyone find anything? You have seen some of them around Iowa City, very plain people wearing a strange dress and hood.

P. Amish?

T. Yes, Amish or Mennonites. Now for to-morrow we'll take a shorter lesson than usual. I'll return your papers, and you look them over and correct them, so you will not have such a long lesson in the book. To-day we took to *bond-servants*. Find out about their life, how they were treated, and how they became free. Take to the top of page 78 where it says "The French explore the Mississippi." Most of this will be review, only three pages in advance. Any questions?

STENOGRAPHIC REPORT OF A LESSON ON COLONIAL INDUSTRIES AND LABOR, UNITED STATES HISTORY, ELEVENTH GRADE.

Textbooks used:

Thompson, "A History of the United States."

Bogart, "Economic History of the United States."

Glenn. To-day we discuss colonial industries and forms of labor. The four chief colonial industries were agriculture, lumbering, manufacturing and ship-building. They also did a great deal of fishing. The labor for manufacturing was secured in the homes of the colonists. These manufactures included cloth-

making, spinning, weaving, boots and shoe-making. The most important was cloth-making.

Mary. The early colonists adopted Indian methods of agriculture, and changed them to suit their own needs. They found the chief crop to be Indian corn. They also did a good deal of fishing in order to have enough to eat. To get rid of the trees and clear their land they would cut, with axes, bands around the trees, and then rot them or burn the roots. During the months of May and June, they would plant their crops and gather them in during September and October. And many didn't have any plows at this time. In 1617 Virginia had a few plows. In 1637 Massachusetts Bay had 37 plows. Because of their scarcity, they were taken from one place to another. And even some of the towns kept plows at a public expense for the use of the farmers.

Ruth. Shall I tell about the colonial laws or about the labor and agriculture?

Teacher. Something about agriculture.

Ruth. Some of the colonists had small farms and some had none at all. Those who didn't have any way of earning a living, hired out. They would like to have had farms of their own. Some of them worked until they could get farms of their own. In the south labor was done by slaves. Outside of New England there was little free labor. There were two classes of servants, indentured servants and slaves. The indentured servants were voluntarily bound by contract to serve a definite length of time, perhaps to pay for their passage over here. They were bound over to a master.

Charles. Is that indentured or indented?

Ruth. In some books it is one and in others it is the other.

Laura. What does it mean by "bound over"?

Ruth. It means that the servant is bound over or under the service of a master for a certain number of years. Sometimes it was seven years. It's just like a man being held by a contract, I should think.

Laura. Most indented servants were from England, Ireland, Scotland, Wales and Germany, and served for a period of from four to ten years. They came to this country for better opportunities to earn a living. After they served their time they often got property.⁴

Ada. There were many laws which regulated the master and the slave. The slave could not stay away without permission. And if they were away one day they have to make it up with two days' work.

They were prohibited to congregate. The treatment of the slaves was different in different parts of the country. Masters were often punished for cruelty to slaves, too, yet masters could flog the slaves. Dutch traders from the West Indies, in January, 1619, brought the first slaves. By 1700, 6,000 were in Virginia. By 1730 in South Carolina, slaves made up one-half the population. The most rapid growth was in South Carolina. The slaves were fewer in the north, because, well, because the crops raised in the north didn't demand slaves, like the southern cotton

⁴ The stenographer failed to get this recitation in full and a discussion followed, pointing out reasons why these people came and comparing with present-day immigration.

fields. There were also laws to prevent the uprising of negroes.

Leona. At first the colonists worked together, and had common storehouses. Perhaps it was something like over at Amana. Soon they gave it up, though, and each worked his own land. It was hard to get laborers because land was cheap and most people preferred to own land than to work for some one else. Those, of course, who had no money had to work for some one. Most of these people were in New England, and were free laborers, not slaves as in the south. Generally a man served for seven years as an apprentice for a trade.

Mary. I don't quite get who the free laborers were.

Teacher. Who can explain it for Mary?

Homer. Oh, they're free—not slaves.

Arnold. Well, I understand in Thompson that they were people without funds.

Teacher. Yes, they are the "moneyless" class—the poor. The apprentice system was a relief for the poor.

Carl. At this time the colonists made everything they needed. They cleared their own land. The most important job was clearing the land. The way they did this, they girdled the trees. When they were dead they cut them down and rolled them away. In a few years the roots would be taken away, or they would rot away. The principal crop was Indian corn, since it could be used in so many different ways. Wheat was raised in some regions to a great extent, because it was preferred above all other grains for bread. Other vegetables were grown by the farmers. Beans were often planted. Tobacco was a staple of Virginia, and it became a most important crop because it was sold in Europe and not raised there.

Orvetta. We find ship-building first at Plymouth. It was begun within three years after the founding of Plymouth in 1620. In 1676 there were 730 ships in Massachusetts. In forty years Massachusetts had ships aggregating 25,000 tons and employed 2,500 sailors. The English did not want America to have ship-building, because it would take her trade and they could not compete on equal terms. Toward the close of the period, an oak vessel could be built in Massachusetts for \$34 a ton, while neither in England nor on the continent could a similar vessel be built for less than \$50 a ton. American ships soon began to crowd out English shipping in their own ports. About 50 New England vessels each year were sold abroad, or nearly one-third of the tonnage sailing under the British flag. This made the British ship-builders complain. Still the navigation acts which we have talked of helped to build up ship-building, and no restriction now was placed on it.

Robert. Another thing the colonists did was to manufacture. Most was done in the home. Most of the woolen and linen cloth was spun and woven inside the home at first. Later it happened that artisans who knew something about textile manufacture came, and fulling mills were built. Probably they made—I mean the colonists made—about three-fourths of what they used. Generally this was coarse stuff.

Charles. What is meant by fulling mills?

Carl. A fulling mill is where the wool is combed out.

Carl H. Well, I looked it up, and found that it is where the cloth is placed in troughs of hot water with fuller's earth and with some sort of a thing called pestles and stampers it is shrunk and cleaned.

Teacher. What is fuller's earth?

Pupil. Fuller's earth is something like clay and is used to clean things.

Teacher. What is the pestle of which you spoke?

Carl H. Oh, that is something they used to punch or pound the cloth with, work it up and down.

Teacher. Is the point clear now, Charles?

Charles. Yes, ma'am.

Rachel. Most of the principal exports from the colonies went to England. I'd like to tell about fishing now. Cod fishing began in 1670, so that in five years there were 655 vessels employed. In 1700 whale fishing began to grow, and in 1721, 260 vessels were employed; fishing was done almost entirely in New England. The training which the New England seamen got made them some of the most daring sailors in the world.

Teacher. Why did you say "almost entirely"? Was it not entirely or exclusively in New England at this time?

Rachel. Yes.

Agnes. Lumbering is another industry of the colonial period. The northern forests were utilized to some extent because they were a quick, cheap export. In the south the forests were cleaned away for tobacco. Artisans were sent to Virginia in 1620 to set up saw-mills, but no saw-mills were set up until 1652. The first saw-mill seems to have been in Dorchester, New England, as early as 1628. The saw-mills helped and hastened the lumbering industry. England wanted our supply of lumber because her own was getting low. Therefore she put no duty on the importation of lumber into her country.

Edward. The colonists did not try to preserve the forests very much. It is perhaps one of the reasons why we have to think more about it to-day.

Arnold. No one spoke of the encouragement given by the colonists to manufacture. They tried to encourage certain manufactures by offering bounties. They offered bounties for manufactured cloth. Export and import duties were levied also by the colonies besides those by England. There were four main tariffs; tonnage duties, duties on shipping, export duties on tobacco, import taxes on slaves, besides the regular tariff schedule. This made a duty on practically all of the manufactured products.

Teacher. Is such a policy pursued to-day?

Pupil. No. We do not need such encouragement now. We have tariff or import duties, though, but not export duties.

Teacher. Can a state to-day levy a duty on goods from another state?

Pupil. No. The Constitution forbids.

Teacher. We shall now consider the assignment for to-morrow.

Recent Tendencies in the Social Studies¹

BY DANIEL C. KNOWLTON, PH.D., LINCOLN SCHOOL, TEACHERS' COLLEGE, NEW YORK CITY.

If I interpret my place on this program aright, I am here primarily to give you a report of progress. I come before you as a sort of propagandist, if this is not inconsistent with my profession as a student and a teacher of history. I am here to make clear just where this Committee on Social Studies of the National Education Association is tending, and to place you in sympathetic relations with its program and with its thinking. This report of progress is to be thought of as supplementing and bringing down to date its printed pronouncements.

In trying to sum up the tendencies in the social studies throughout the country, let me insist that I am reflecting the tendencies noted by the Committee on History and Education for Citizenship and other committees at work upon the problem of the social studies. This committee of yours is simply trying to reflect the best tendencies and formulate them into a program. We do not insist that these committees are either omnipotent or omniscient. It has already been pointed out that committees have their limitations. But it is the object of this committee and others to give you the results of the best thinking and practice.

The first tendency which I would note is that of regarding the social studies as a unit. The day is fast passing when they were conceived as competing with each other for recognition. The attitude of these committees is not so much that of saving their own subject in the curriculum as of determining to just what extent each can function in the curriculum. They would preserve only what in their judgment would contribute to the life of the child, paying due regard to the values inherent in the subject.

This brings me to my second point, that the content of these social studies is to be interpreted primarily in terms of citizenship values. When the committee of which I am secretary was asked to reorganize the work in history they immediately conceived their task in terms of the demands of citizenship, and called themselves the Committee on History and Education for Citizenship. They immediately sought the co-operation, as has been the case with our N. E. A. Committee, of all those representatives of the social studies who were interested in the citizenship problem.

These committees, unlike their predecessors, have conceived of their task in much larger terms than heretofore. To revert again to the Committee on History and Education for Citizenship. Although appointed to deal primarily with the four-year high school, when they set themselves to their task, they discovered that secondary education had been projected much farther back into the school life of the

child, and they must consider the junior high school problem. The committee of the N. E. A., true prophets that they were, anticipated this situation. Not only was the Committee on History confronted with this longer secondary school period, but they found that it was difficult to plan a program for the upper grades without formulating or defining what was to be the basis for this work in the lower grades. The history committees of the past had each taken a bite of the cherry with little regard for the bites already taken, and in some cases I fear there was no cherry left to bite. The N. E. A. Committee during its recent session here at Cleveland, recognizing the necessity of a comprehensive program for the twelve years, continually raised the question as to what was to be the content of the grades before and after those under consideration. They also recognized the necessity of projecting their work back over the first six grades if they were to place before the schools a satisfactory program for the six years of the secondary school.

My next point represents a very radical departure, but a very real tendency. It has been felt by these committees, reflecting sentiment throughout the country, that the time has come for courses which shall be mandatory in character. I trust this word will not be misunderstood. They say that the Turks have great difficulty with these words, mandate and mandatory, confusing them with their word for buffalo. I trust you will not attach to it any such meaning. Our committee in its recent conference was of the opinion that five periods a week for six years should be devoted to the social studies in the secondary school. The Committee on History insists upon two years of history in the tenth and eleventh grades, and strongly recommends a course in civics for the ninth year and a course in problems of democracy in the twelfth. They were thinking and planning in terms of history, and their recommendations have been accepted by the N. E. A. Committee with the addition of the two years already mentioned. The time is past for pussy-footing on this issue. The war has shown that we must have these subjects in the curriculum. Remember, too, that I am speaking of minimum requirements. This is the last trench, behind which we do not propose to retreat.

Again these committees are planning in terms of a forward-looking program. We feel that the time has come, not simply for crystallizing the practice of the better schools, but if possible, for setting up something ahead of this towards which the schools may be working. It will probably not be possible for every school system to adopt this program in its entirety. This may prove to be the exception rather than the rule. We feel that no community should consider it-

¹ Address delivered before the Department on the Reorganization of Secondary Education of the National Education Association, Cleveland, 1920.

self unprogressive if it fails to put the whole program in operation. Let it adopt such parts of it as are possible under given conditions, leaving the other parts to be added as circumstances permit. These committees also propose in working out their courses to stress method as well as subject matter. History, for example, has suffered by being regarded too much as a body of subject matter. The present tendency is to place greater emphasis than heretofore upon the method by which the subject is to be handled. Perhaps in many cases it will be found that the primary value of the subject is derivable from the method employed rather than the subject matter presented.

Another tendency to be recognized in these reports is that of defining more exactly each of the fields—defining them in terms which will make it clear to average teachers what it is that they are expected to do. We must clearly differentiate between these subjects, and we must have comprehensive syllabi, but not of the old type. They must be of the "talking" variety, capable of conveying to their users the main points involved in successful work in the given field. Nor do these committees ignore the scientific bases upon which all these courses rest. These cannot be ignored if we are to build for the future. With this thought in mind the N. E. A. Committee is adding to its membership a worker in the field of educational research. Much is still to be done to ascertain the scientific bases of work in the social studies. The committee will act in the light of all that is available in this field. Let me emphasize again in this connection the spirit of co-operation which has characterized

all that our committee has done. In the recent meeting there was present, by invitation, the chairman of a committee of the American Sociological Society with a report covering the field in which they were interested. He with us was interested in reaching an understanding and in presenting a common program.

In the field of history the tendency is markedly in the direction of emphasizing the modern field, in establishing contacts with the world of to-day with its immediate background. It is not beyond the hope of those at work on the content of this field that a course will be evolved which will be international in character, and with the closer bonds which we trust will be cemented between nations as the result of the war, that this will become international in its use. These nations are thinking in the same terms as are those Americans of international minds—the breed not having become altogether extinct; like us, they see in the evolution of democracy the solution of many of their problems. Our program in history looks essentially towards the better understanding and appreciation of democracy as it has evolved in modern times. In conclusion, let me quote the words of Paul Mantoux, the famous French writer, who, addressing an English audience in 1917, put the situation as follows: "The key to the whole question lies in choosing the subjects so that our teaching of history may help in building up democracy. This war opens a new and unbounded era of democratic development. Let us help young men to understand the forces behind rising democracy and to be ready to take their part in its growth and direction."

Methods of Checking Collateral Reading

BY ARVIL S. BARR, A.M., INDIANA UNIVERSITY.

A recent article in the *HISTORICAL OUTLOOK*¹ set forth in a suggestive manner the failings of the loose-leaf notebook as a method of checking up on collateral reading in the secondary schools. In fact, the method has been so unsatisfactory to a great many teachers that they have in some instances desired to discontinue outside reading altogether. It is not, however, the requirement that is at fault, but rather the method of handling the requirement.

The pupils themselves have some valuable suggestions on the use of the notebook that should not be overlooked. A questionnaire submitted to several successive classes in history showed the pupil's attitude to be about as follows: The pupils felt that it did not help them to fix facts in mind; that it did not help them to understand the outside reading; that it did not necessarily encourage neatness; that it was of no help in reviewing for examinations; that it encouraged copying from other pupils; that it allowed work to pile up at the end of the semester; that notes could be taken without reading the references; and that it killed all interest in history. These were conclusions reached after a number of plans for checking up outside reading had been used. These facts alone

as given by the pupils would not form an absolute basis for condemning the notebook. Nevertheless they are good indications of the failure of the notebook as a method of checking outside reading.

Unfortunately reading other than that done in the textbook has come to be known as "outside reading." It is something extra rather than a vital part of the daily recitation. While there are many examples of the other type of teaching, in general, the old idea that it is "outside reading" remains. And again we find it necessary to "check up" on this reading. Evidently the ordinary every-day recitation does not offer a clue to the content and extent of the reading done outside the textbook. The reading is not a part of the day's work. The plan that will be most satisfactory in checking up on outside reading will be one that brings this extra information to bear naturally and freely upon the regular daily class discussion. It must be an integral part of the recitation.

Among the other methods that have been used is that of a weekly reading slip stating merely the number of pages read. There are many variations in

¹ Paul T. Smith, "A Suggestion on the History Notebook," *HISTORICAL OUTLOOK*, April, 1919.

this plan. Although that method is frequently used it is quite evident that it offers the teacher no way by which the additional material can be woven into the daily discussions, not to mention the objection that many have, that there is a real doubt as to whether the reading is really ever done. Another method occasionally used is to give a certain number of readings from time to time and to check up on these by examinations. This method is good in that the reading must be done. In many respects it is superior to the notebook plan. One difficulty here, however, is that only a small range of references can be used. All pupils must be required to read certain set references, all of which will not be of particular interest to the pupil. Here again the fundamental error is that the reading is a matter to be taken care of on the outside. It is doubtful whether either of these plans will prove satisfactory.

Then there is the card filing system recommended recently in the article already referred to above. In many ways this system is an improvement over the old notebook method. A semester's trial with this method alone and later trials with it in combination with other methods have shown that it does overcome many of the evils developed by the notebook. Two added arguments might be: First, that the card system is the recognized method in historical research, and second, that practically all modern business houses use the filing system in some form. However, against this must be put certain practical questions—loss of cards, cost, grading, etc. But here again it seems that the aim is to patch up the old system rather than to go beyond. If we stop at this point we have the same old problem—"outside reading"—and the materials cannot conveniently be made a part of the regular class discussion. To this end I have found it advisable to add another step—"the daily slip"—to a *voluntary* card filing system or a notebook.

The "daily slip method" meets in a way many of the objections given to other plans. The method, as it is commonly used, works as follows: When the assignment is made the most important topics of the lesson are noted. Attention is called to a number of topics especially suited for reports. These are not assigned to the individual pupil. He is given a choice. However, some outside reading must be done every day. When the pupil enters the recitation room the next day he leaves a slip on the teacher's desk stating the topic in which he has special interest and the references which he has used in making his preparation. While the class takes two or three minutes to glance through the reading matter in the text for the day, the teacher sorts the slips and arranges them in order of the day's discussion. If the topic of the recitation is "The Old Regime in France," when the teacher comes to the sub-topic of the "Court of Versailles," after a few preliminary questions to the class at large, he can unsuspectingly weave in the interesting and special prepared material from the outside. It is not a report. It is an answer to a regu-

lar class question. It is a part of the discussion. When the topic of the "Court of Versailles" has been pretty thoroughly exhausted, the teacher turns to the "System of local government," "The unpopular taxes," etc., each time making the outside material a part of the lesson of the day.

The center of interest is the pupil. The recitation is socialized. And with a little coaching of the class and a clear understanding that the pupils have a right to talk (as well as the teacher), the method leads naturally and freely to many profitable discussions. Of course, it is quite apparent that in a large class not every pupil can talk at length every day. Nevertheless just as with textbook material, every pupil is held responsible and must be ready to talk at any time. Each report is graded at the time, and the grade entered on the slip. As for the class, they are held accountable through the regular examinations for all new material introduced into the class discussions. Incidentally such a plan leads to a wideawake class, gives point to a class notebook, and makes the recitation really worth attending.

It is felt that a method of this sort makes the outside reading really a vital part of the recitation. It requires that the outside reading must be done and done every day. It is not extra; it is a part of the recitation. It requires that the reading be understood. It not only must be understood, but must be remembered. It is not something that can be copied from some one else; it must be prepared. It meets the hearty approval of the pupils; it is a time-saver for the teacher, and finally promises to change history from a dry notebook grind into the most interesting and profitable subject in the entire high school curriculum.

In *The Quarterly Journal of Economics* for February, 1920, N. S. B. Gras discusses "The Present Condition of Economic History," saying: "Present tendencies are in direction of greater emphasis on economic history after a period of partial eclipse in the last few years, stress put on history of capital and labor because of growing antagonism between the two; this drift might be balanced by other studies which reflect a more complete analysis of content of economic history; that chronology and periodic treatment might well be supplanted by genetic; and that the guidance of economic history until now in the able hands of historians and economists might henceforth more profitably be lodged with specialists in the field."

In the article on "Sweden, Finland and Aland" (*American Scandinavian Review* for February), Yngve Hedvall says of this interesting group of islands lying between Sweden and Finland, that their strategic position has made them an object of desire and of discussion by the powers of Europe. They hold the key to the Gulf of Bothnia, and are important for the mastery of the entire northern Baltic.

Department of Social Studies

EDITED IN CO-OPERATION WITH

The National Committee for Teaching Citizenship

THOMAS M. BALLIET, Chairman

HARRY H. MOORE, Secretary

THOMAS JESSE JONES, Chairman of Editorial Committee

DANIEL C. KNOWLTON, Vice-Chairman

LAURENCE C. STAPLES, Executive Secretary,

3421 Lowell Street, N. W. Washington, D. C.

THE "CASE GROUP" APPROACH TO PROGRAMS OF CIVIC EDUCATION.

BY PROFESSOR DAVID SNEDDEN,
TEACHERS' COLLEGE, COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY.

Most adult Americans are now fairly good citizens; but they are not good enough to meet our more complex needs and our more exacting standards. Hence America wants more and better education for citizenship; and it seems probable that much of this additional education must be expected from schools, rather than from home, churches, community contacts, political parties, and the other agencies that have, with the schools, given us such good citizenship as we now have.

The citizenship of our men and women now varies greatly. Some are very good, some very bad, and many are average in composite good citizenship. But also the citizenship of the different social groups and classes obviously varies greatly. The species "illiterate negro men in the South of from thirty to forty years of age" contains some very good and some very bad citizens; but the majority exhibit certain *prevailing* qualities (civic virtues and civic vices) that are characteristic. Similarly the species, "men high school teachers, ages thirty to fifty," contains some very good and a few very bad citizens; but the majority exhibit certain distinguishable prevailing civic virtues and vices, which are sometimes unlike in kind, and often in degree, those exhibited by the species, "illiterate negro men."

Much of current theory and practice of civic education, following the easy ways of deductive reasoning from *a priori* premises (themselves often of doubtful sociological validity) so tends towards assumptions of the uniformity as to become unserviceably vague, general, Utopian. These "lumping" characterizations include: (a) educands—"the boy," "the pupil," the high school pupil, the negro, the immigrant, the drafted soldier, the new woman voter; (b) objectives—"good citizenship," Americanization, patriotism, knowledge of history, obedience to law; and (c) means and methods—civil government, American history, the "project method," etc. Many of these unanalyzed and indiscriminating characterizations are as primitive and unhelpful as the sweeping formulæ of old-time medicine and of Bolshevik political science. They tend to rule out of court social diagnosis and prognosis. They prescribe uniform treatment for

well and sick, and for those of good, as well as for those of bad, civic prospects. They ignore the implications of "job analysis," as this might be applied to the "job" of citizenship; and their effort is a constant disregarding of the contributions towards approved citizenship of homes, community associations, labor unions, the police power, etc.

The situation would not be so confused if the "materials," the "organized knowledge," the available subject-matter of civic education, were not so superabundant. World history, American history, industrial history, political science, "civil government," matter descriptive of local governmental agencies, economics, social science, and now sociology are as extensive and inexhaustible as the oceans of air above us. Like that air they contain valuable stores of fertilizing and dynamic nitrogen if economical processes of *fixation* can be discovered. Anyone can tap these reservoirs; and any speculative thinker can give opinions as to how profitable fixation—i.e., civic education—ought to be effected. But most proposals seem to break down in *commercial practice* (if the analogy may be pressed).

It is the writer's present opinion that the most promising method for the discovery of *valid* and *practicable* objectives of civic education in schools for various age, environment and (if it should yet seem desirable) ability groups, as well as for devising best methods of realizing those objectives, is what may be called the "case group" method. The chief value of this method is, of course, to force us to consider real human beings instead of abstractions, to think in terms of civic qualities as ends, and of subject matter as means, instead of, as now, thinking of subject matter formulations practically as ends in themselves. But other values will also appear as we proceed. Let us place ourselves in the position of a competent committee of three enjoined to study the entire matter of civic education, to point the way to experimentation, and to derive as rapidly as practicable, working programs.

First, the committee must agree provisionally upon analytical or descriptive definitions of what it intends to convey by the terms "citizenship," "good citizenship," and "education for citizenship." Needless to say, much confusion exists here, and at certain points arbitrary decisions may well be made. But the definitions will not be serviceable unless (a) they indicate

analytically which virtues and vices, moral, civic, religious, and the like, are excluded, as well as which are included (e.g., is "good citizenship" the same as "good manhood"? Is education for health or for vocation also education for citizenship?), and unless (b) they indicate, at least provisional ratings for given social groups, of the comparative importance of the various virtues and vices detailed.

Next the committee will take for careful study two more fairly well defined social groups, for example: Case M men, college graduates of American birth, ages thirty-five to fifty-five, in business; and case P men, owning farmers, of American birth, ages thirty-five to fifty-five, in Kansas and Nebraska. It may prove desirable still further to delimit and define these groups; only experience can show.

A thousand individual cases, selected at random from each group, will doubtless show some very "good" and some very "bad" citizens by the standards of the definitions. Apart from these extremes, large or "type" proportions will be "prevailing" good in certain respects and prevailing "not what they should be" in others.

It is not necessary to assume (nor would it be practicable now to procure) exhaustive social analysis here. Surely competent sociological or political observers should, even on the basis of general experience, give fairly reliable answers to questions like these:

a. Is the proportion of criminals large in either case group?

b. How do the two groups compare as regards the civic virtues of conformity—respect for laws, conservatism, party fidelity, payment of debts, general morality, etc.?

c. How do they compare as respects virtues of initiative—independence of political action, reforming spirit, party leadership, social aggression, pioneering of revolutions, etc.?

d. How do they compare as respects specified vices of conformity—excessive conservatism, clannishness, opposition to innovations, etc.?

e. How do they compare as respects specified vices of initiative (individual or "small group")—such as anarchism, disloyalty, disregard of parties, political free-booting?

f. What, in each group, are the most conspicuous civic shortcomings which we should like to see corrected in the next generation?

Among the boys of to-day are many who will succeed to the work, opportunities and responsibilities of the adults in the above groups. Let the committee temporarily waive the problem of whether we can now predict which boys of given age levels will probably do so. Let it assume for purposes of scientific analysis of objectives that a large proportion of the boys now in certain suburbs (case M-a boys) will succeed case M men, and that a large proportion of those in the rural schools of Kansas and Nebraska will succeed the case P men (case P-a boys).

Having these respective groups of boys under con-

sideration, the committee will now proceed to make certain prognoses.

a. Given substantial continuance of forces now operative—home, school, community environment, rising standards of living, etc.—what will case P-a boys of ten to sixteen to-day in Kansas rural environment probably become in from fifteen to thirty years, as respects citizenship? How will they probably compare, in prevailing numbers, with their fathers? As respects what civic virtues will they probably be superior to their fathers? Inferior? To what conditions of environment will such new civic deficiencies as they may be expected to show be probably due?

b. The social situations into which these boys mature (those who remain to become owning farmers) will probably be markedly different from those to which their fathers had to adapt themselves. We might prognosticate weakening of historic party lines; multiplication of public or government functions; increased necessity of collective buying, selling, utilization of large machines, etc. In what respects will these expected new social needs impose requirements for civic qualities that the fathers of these boys do not adequately possess?

c. Where specific programs of civic education in schools are devised to prevent or correct expected civic deficiencies, what may we reasonably predict as to good citizenship effects some years hence, from citizens who as case P-a boys now are found to grade respectively low, inferior, superior, and high, in intelligence?

In the expectation of probable civic deficiencies, programs of preventive or corrective civic education would be made. The satisfactory definition of specific objectives and the determination of means and methods would probably necessitate observance of certain principles, as, for example:

a. They should be made on the basis of prognosis of administrative limitations—usual ages of compulsory or voluntary school attendance, funds to be had, kinds of teachers and departmentalizing of teaching available, methods devised, etc. Some kinds of work, for example, could be done if consolidated schools and specialized teaching were presupposed. During the next few years many of these boys will leave school at 16, with only elementary education; what is provided must fit within this available time.

b. Experiment may show the superior availability of certain types of means and methods at specified age levels: "Developmental" (i.e., story, biography) American history, grades 3-6, "projective" American history (formal, purposive), grades 7 and 8 for facts and ready-made interpretations, grade 12 for critical and evaluative (problem) interpretations; "participation projects," grades 6 to 8; "dramatized projects," grades 4 to 7; community "concrete contact" civics (of associate groups), grades 5 to 7; community civics, didactic and slightly observational (federate groups), grades 7 to 9; civil government (formal didactic) (federate group membership), grades 8 to 10; "self-teaching," "thick" books of

description, etc., grades 7 to 12; didactic economics or social science, grades 9 to 11; contemporary social problem method, grades 11 to 12.

From (a) and (b) should, of course, be devised adjustments needed for P-a boys. One student, following this method reaches the conclusion that the "self-teaching" "thick" book is the most promising available means for P-a boys.

Similar approaches could be made for case M-a boys. The eventuating programs will probably be unlike in many respects. Should that not be expected? Different kinds of boys are being dealt with; the educative effects of their environments are very different; their school opportunities are far from being the same; the expectations of good citizenship that society has a right to expect should probably be very dissimilar.

This method becomes, of course, more difficult where we presuppose extremely dynamic environments. It would be difficult to prognosticate the adult citizenship of New York boys of Russian Jewish immediate ancestry, if schools gave no purposive civic education. The only thing certain is that they will be very different from their parents.

Similar difficulties would be encountered in trying to devise programs of civic education for: (a) negro children in northern cities; (b) children of Pennsylvania soft coal miners; (c) bright children in poor rural areas (most of whom will migrate); and (d) children of the "slums."

Several interesting problems appear as results of the general method here suggested. In the field of social education (here taken to include all objectives primarily of moral, civic, and religious education, and excluding all objectives primarily physical, vocational, and cultural), educational writers have long preferred to float in cloudlands of speculation, playing hide-and-seek among the billowing fogbanks of "fundamental principles." They have usually avoided concrete contacts with such social realities as mental and moral variabilities of native powers, positive and negative effects of material and social environments, and the limitations (modern at least) of what is here called the "didactic" method of presentation (formal instruction or training, especially for *knowledge*). To the present writer it appears:

a. That as yet we have no acceptable agreed upon formulations of what educators mean by citizenship, civism, civic efficiency, good citizenship, education for citizenship, and the like. The *ex parte* pleader, and departmental specialists, tend to include all virtues, desirable traits, approved qualities, under good citizenship. But makers of programs for upper grades obviously have in mind chiefly political or "large group" qualities. Practical difficulties arise, therefore. Is training in handwriting one contribution towards good citizenship? Should we designate as "civic education" the learning of a trade? When we "instill" love of good music, are we still in the region of civic objectives? We greatly need here extensive concrete analysis of the qualities—of all kinds—

which should constitute objectives of education; and agreement upon elementary classifications and terminology.

b. That in all programs of civic education (in the limited sense) that we now use, mechanistic aspects of social, including political, economic and governmental, action are overstressed; while functional aspects, especially those comprehensible to the learner, receive insufficient attention. The analogy to methods of teaching of anatomy and physiology in former years will occur.

c. That our pedagogic ideals of method give prominent place to "activities" in civics teaching; but these are still chiefly "pole-star" ideals, the "lighthouse" ideals being largely non-existent as yet. Hence our actual objectives take the form chiefly of the more or less forceful impartation of knowledge—facts, generalizations, dogmas, logically arranged. But it is questionable whether even very skilful teachers can make these "didactic" methods more than partially effective towards functioning standards and habits of later civic behavior.

d. That we seriously underestimate the inventiveness, amounting often to great talent, required to make "activity" methods—projects, self-government, co-operative undertakings, public service supervision—give persistent results.

e. That we have seriously disregarded and undervalued the suggestive possibilities for method, of numerous procedures that, outside the school, are now actively functional in producing some kinds of civic virtues, often without the intervention of any conscious educational intent. At one extreme of this type is scouting; at the other stories, movies, and gang operations craved and sought by youth.

f. That it is especially important for us to examine the possibilities, as means of certain forms of civic education, for specified groups and towards specified ends, of various history studies, especially in the two types of situations when: (1) the teacher is of average interpreting and inspirational power (for that field), and the objective history content is regarded as important; and (2) the teacher is expected to be of exceptional power and the history content a relative minor means. It is suggested that probably all current thinking greatly overvalues history as a means of social education, except for the rare spirits who early develop exceptional constructive social imagination.

g. And, finally, that when we get to the stage of experimental procedure in all these fields we shall find ourselves forced to proceed through detailed consideration of clearly delimited case groups and by means of provisional objectives of the most concrete character.

In discussing "Bolshevism in America" (*Current Opinion* for March), Peter W. Collins, Director-General of Reconstruction and Employment for the Knights of Columbus, gives fifteen excellent reasons why the labor movement opposes Bolshevism.

COMMENTS ON A SOCIAL SCIENCE COURSE.

BY J. C. PETERS, SUPERIOR HIGH SCHOOL.

Since the first appearance of man upon this planet tremendous and sweeping changes have taken place. As we roll back the curtain of even the past few centuries, the most unobserving mind will readily detect stupendous developments. We have passed from a relatively simple to a complex life; from a state of comparative independence to interdependence, from dependence on material things to dependence on each other.

This drama of evolution forms a very proper introduction to a course in social science. It provides at once the historical background of our present human society and a fundamental concept with which every student of social conditions must be acquainted. It furnishes a brief survey of the field to be covered, and also leads to a gradual understanding of the dynamic character of social phenomena. This may be done without the mention of the word evolution.

The grasping of this fundamental idea sets in motion an educational development of vast significance. Especially is this true in the field of government. The idea that we must persist in doing as society and our fathers have done before us, is one of the most serious drags on social and political progress that is known to-day. More real progress has been made since the idea of social evolution has so firmly established itself in educational thought and literature than had been made during several of the centuries immediately preceding. This idea, firmly inculcated into the students' minds, forms one of the greatest values in a social science course.

Given this approach, the basis is laid for the study of some of the most important work of social amelioration and reconstruction. The progress of the past has been for the most part incidental. It is time for this blind progress to be superseded by progress that is deliberately designed. Pupils must be led to see that the progress of the race has not been made by a single mark of the pen or a single stroke of the sword. Rather has it been due to the cumulative experience of men and nations groping slowly out of darkness into light. We must, therefore, build on the experience of the past, using this to direct our choice of ameliorative measures.

Another value to be sought in an elementary social science course is the habit of careful and accurate observation. This is essential not only because of its importance as a habit to be cultivated, but also because the facts observed in this course may serve as a laboratory material for succeeding courses in the social sciences. The case of a certain Illinois sheriff may be cited in this connection. He insisted that we revert to the medieval notion of repression as a theory of punishment for crime. Only executive interference prevented this sheriff from hanging a prisoner in plain view of all the others as evidence of "what was coming to them." The pupils quickly pointed out that such a theory of punishment is a medieval

notion, and that it was just such a theory that led England to create so many horrible methods of punishment during the previous century—only to conclude finally that "crime thrives upon severe penalties."

This habit of careful and accurate observation reacts in many ways. Pupils are usually very anxious to report in class articles they have read from magazines and books. It has, therefore, stimulated reading and investigation. It has done more than this: it has caused them to think for themselves as they read, to read intelligently.

The greater portion of a textbook in this subject, such as Towne's "Social Problems," deals with the evils, or weaknesses of the existing social order. It may be held that too small a portion is devoted to constructive measures. However, it should be remembered that problems only arise out of abnormal conditions. If conditions were normal, the problem would not exist. The task is to determine what must be done to bring conditions back to normal. Any scheme of action thus calls for a most thorough understanding of the existing evils. Throughout the work there is a large opportunity for the resourceful teacher to encourage a child to express his ideas in some form of pictorial illustration. When reading the chapter on crime, the pupil may be asked to bring pictures showing conditions promoting its growth. Among these will be found scenes showing crowded and congested portions of a city, deserted houses and factory buildings, open and unguarded buildings and warehouses; diamonds or jewelry placed near a window; a safe placed near a door in the rear. When asked for pictures showing conditions that prevent crime the pupils are always able to furnish drawings or pictures cut from magazines showing playgrounds, swimming pools, reading rooms, wholesome games and amusements, pictures of boys and girls learning a trade, watchful policemen, and many others.

At no place in the work need a pupil lack an opportunity for this method of expression. We have brought to class some splendid cartoon material illustrating such topics as "How wages affect the home," "How the home affects society," "Homes where children are bread-winners," "Noble virtues cherished in the family."

Statistics as such seldom appeal even to the advanced student. Many readers omit statistical matter entirely when they come upon it in print. Statistics showing the distribution of immigrants may mean very little when read. But if pins are placed on a map with ribbons of various colors attached to show the different nationality groups and their distribution, the facts then take on flesh and blood.

Comparisons of the actual city expenditures for street cleaning, street lighting, water, sewage, education, police and fire protection, and public education can be compared and shown very interestingly by means of graphic devices, such as stacks of money made in stacks proportional to the several expenditures.

Probably no device can be worked more effectively

than debate. This is especially true in the citizenship course the last half of the freshman year. Questions of government naturally lend themselves to debate, and usually material for discussion is not lacking.

The work at the Superior High School has been based on the assumption that the foregoing are some of the real essentials. Any detailed array of facts in the course may soon be forgotten, and a number of them will need constant revision. After all, the most valuable results are a wholesome interest, a correct point of view, and a sympathetic appreciation of the real nature of some of the problems encountered in an attempt to direct deliberately the progress of society.

IN THE FIELD OF SOCIAL STUDIES.

College freshmen are a selected group. They have already in most cases enjoyed particular opportunities at school and at home. It may reasonably be expected that they are above the average in intelligence and knowledge, and know more than other young men of their age concerning the common problems which confront their country.

Yet a study of ninety freshmen at Amherst College, reported by Robert Phillips in *Education*, April, 1920, shows a startling situation. Without previous warning, these men were asked a series of very simple questions on current public problems. The following are typical examples of the questions: Define the referendum, boycott, spoils system, anarchist. Who is Elbert H. Gary, W. Z. Foster, Samuel Gompers, Robert La Follette? What was the purpose of the Industrial Conference in Washington? What is the Plumb Plan? What is the Non-Partisan League? What do you know about Tammany Hall? Altogether there were twenty-four questions, of which twelve have been mentioned. That complete answers were by no means required is indicated by the fact that a definition of anarchist as one who believes in the overthrow of government was graded 100 per cent.

The average made by the freshmen in answer to these questions was 42 per cent.; 80 per cent. knew who Gompers was, but this made a record. Only 26 per cent. understood what a lobby is, and 77 per cent. could not explain the difference between "pork barrel" and budget. "Soviet" stuck every man in the class. Only one man was familiar with the name of W. Z. Foster. "The figures," states Mr. Phillips, "come far from telling the whole truth. One must see the answers to appreciate the utter bewilderment with which these young men struggled on being confronted with matters with which every American should be familiar."

Further inquiry revealed that while a considerable proportion had taken a course in civics, this course had amounted to very little. Several students reported two years of ancient history and no American history! A negligible proportion had had courses in economics, sociology and the like.

Mr. Phillips closes his statement as follows: "We need to develop early in the schools a permanent interest in public affairs, in the solution of public problems. The lessons growing out of the war and its aftermath are pointing unmistakably that way. The country is insistently demanding it, and it looks as though the anachronistic educator will have to be drawn in and carried away by the strong current of public opinion."

At the Central High School, Minneapolis, Minn., each student in the sociology class is required to subscribe for the *Survey*. One period a week is devoted to this magazine. In addition, officers of the local Bureau of Associated Charities and of the Board of Charities and Corrections are invited to give talks on local social problems. In this way the students keep closely in touch with actual problems and conditions existing to-day, and so develop an interest which is likely to continue after the systematic work of the school has been completed.

Among those who have recently shown an interest in the work of the committee is Mr. Frank A. Vanderlip, formerly president of the First National Bank, New York City. Before a meeting of the New York Economic Club, Mr. Vanderlip recently declared: "We throw money about with a prodigal hand while we throttle the fountain head of national life, the educational system. If we put the \$750,000,000 planned for universal military training into universal training in the principles of government and economics, America will be 'safe for democracy.'"

In a letter to the committee, Mr. Vanderlip states: "I feel deeply the importance of such teaching in our secondary schools. For two years I have been doing a little laboratory experimenting in the Scarborough School, which is located on my place here at Scarborough, and there is no longer the slightest doubt in my mind that children of high school age, and even of the upper grammar grades, are entirely competent to grasp many of the economic principles involved in some of our great social problems."

That Mr. Vanderlip, who has shown particularly keen insight into present political, social, and economic problems, should have come to this conclusion is one of the strongest endorsements of the movement in which the committee is so vitally interested.

On March 26 Dr. Thomas Jesse Jones, on behalf of the committee, addressed a meeting of the Schoolmasters' Club of Massachusetts in Boston.

Doctor Jones pointed out that while social studies are making good progress in secondary schools, the emphasis continues to be largely on the political and economic aspects of present-day problems rather than the sociological. This, he believed, was unfortunate. In particular, it neglected the entire field of social psychology which has especial importance in these days of group activity.

As to the sociology which should be taught in high schools, Doctor Jones stated that his attitude toward

this matter was very much like his attitude toward the League of Nations. It is necessary first of all to make a start. Let us have some sort of a League, some sort of sociology anyway. We can then discover more successfully the best sort of sociology to teach.

Sociology courses at the present time are inclined to put too much emphasis on abnormalities and their correction. In the study of the family, for instance, much time is taken up with the forerunners of the present monogamous family. When we come to the present day, it is not the normal family which is considered—the position of the mother, democracy in the family, the home ideal—but rather abnormal conditions, such as divorce. These are important, but they must not be allowed to monopolize the time and interest.

These questions of detail, important as they are, are secondary to the great question of introducing some work in this field. The discussion which Doctor Jones' talk aroused indicates that the schoolmasters of Massachusetts are alive to this need and are making plans to meet it.

Periodical Literature

BY GERTRUDE BRAMLETTE RICHARDS, PH.D.

"Dramatic Scenes in My Career in Congress," by Hon. Joseph G. Cannon, is now running in *Harper's*.

"Whose the Success," by William E. Dodd, and "Wilson the Failure," by W. M. Fullerton, appear in *World's Work* for March. The author of the former says: "Wilson's work since he entered the White House has been marvelous; . . . he spared not himself, challenged Congress and all public officials to keep his pace, and quickly stirred the whole country to new conceptions of public duty. The tone of public life was lifted to a high plane. What he said and did in those exciting and sometimes awful years must ever remain a heritage of the people."

In *Blackwood's Magazine* for February, 1920, Major W. H. L. Watson, D.S.O., gives an interesting account of the second battle of Le Cateau in his article on "A Company of Yanks," the sixteenth chapter in the series presented by this periodical.

In writing on "The Covenant or the Constitution" in *The North American Review* for March, David Jayne Hill says: "The only real and persistent objector to the 'reservations' is the President of the United States who sees in the power to control the action of the League by the vote of the American representatives, no rejection of the obligations of the treaty so long as this is left in the hands of the Executive; but the moment the action of Congress is substituted and instead of its 'own representative,' the President, Congress itself undertakes to act, the obligations of the Covenant are ignored, the heart of the treaty is cut out, and the whole scheme is nullified."

"In a sane, historical and cultured consideration of the career of man . . . indebtedness of Greek civilization to the Orient does not in the least distract from the ever-challenged supremacy which the splendor of Greek genius triumphantly attained as the sixth century B. C. advanced. . . . Hellenic genius never permitted the Greeks to remain merely passive recipients of culture from without. Build-

ing on foundations largely Oriental, they erected a splendid structure of civilization which nobly expressed their marvelous gifts and brought them unchallenged supremacy which was already evident in the sixth century B. C. Leadership in civilization then passed finally and definitely from the Orient to Greece," says Prof. James Henry Breasted [?] in his article on "The Origins of Civilization," which appears in the *March Scientific Monthly*.

In discussing "Small Councils and Cabinets in England" (*Sewanee Review*, January-March), E. R. Turner says: "From the days of the Tudors, kings attempting to create more effective administration had, along with their privy council, made use of parts or committees thereof. . . . Parliamentarians complained of this concentration of power in a small body hid behind the larger. . . . But the tendency was irresistible and from the time of the Restoration continued apace."

Notes from the Historical Field

NEW ENGLAND ASSOCIATION.

The annual spring meeting of the New England History Teachers' Association was held at the Central High School, Springfield, Mass., on Saturday, March 20. The most important matter of business was a vote authorizing the committee on an Ancient History syllabus to conclude its negotiations and enter into an agreement with the D. C. Heath Company. The syllabus which this committee has produced will probably be ready for sale some time this spring.

The general subject of the meeting of the association was "Education for Citizenship: Its Relation to the Teaching of History and Government." Prof. George B. Churchill, of Amherst College, who is also a Massachusetts State Senator, spoke on "Training in Citizenship a Common Need." Dr. Jessie M. Law, of the Springfield Central High School, discussed "Citizenship and the Teaching of History." Mr. Roy W. Hatch, of the Horace Mann School and of the Teachers' College of Columbia University, read a paper on "The Teaching of Government as an Aid to Better Citizenship."

At the luncheon held at the Hotel Bridgway, Dr. James H. Van Sickle, superintendent of Springfield schools, extended greetings to the association. Prof. Bertha H. Putnam, of Mt. Holyoke College, gave a very interesting talk on "Recent Impressions of England."

RHODE ISLAND HISTORY TEACHERS.

After a period of desultory activity due to its exertions in war work, the Rhode Island History Teachers' Association, under the leadership of Prof. St. George L. Sioussat, of Brown University, is being reorganized for active reconstruction work in history.

In line with this new policy, a history conference was held by the association in connection with the annual meeting of the Brown University Teachers' Association. At this conference much time was given to the Cleveland report of the Committee on History and Education for Citizenship.

Mr. A. Howard Williamson, Principal of the A. P. Hoyt School, East Providence, opened the discussion with a brief history of the work of this Committee on History, culminating in its preliminary report presented in the *HISTORICAL OUTLOOK* for June, 1919. He further pointed out subsequent criticisms of the preliminary report which led to the revised reports presented to the American Historical Association at Cleveland, December 29, 1919.

Mrs. Margaret Irons, Department of History, Rhode Island State Normal School, Providence, followed with a

summary of the revised Cleveland report of the committee, and pointed out some ways in which the Normal Training School was experimenting with this proposed course of study for the purpose of evaluating its features for Rhode Island Schools.

Professor Sioussat, of Brown University, drew attention to the pitfalls into which the attempts to stimulate interest in the study of history would lead, and he urged that throughout the elementary schools, high schools, and colleges there be more emphasis on proper historical methods and subject-matter, instancing examples of what he thought could be accomplished along these lines.

Many other teachers, principals, and supervisors exchanged opinions, and the meeting was one of the best ever held by the association.

To aid in this reorganization, another meeting is planned for April 17, at which final steps will be taken to make the association a greater power in the teaching of history in Rhode Island.

The secretary of the association is Mr. A. Howard Williamson, of the A. P. Hoyt Grammar School, East Providence, Rhode Island.

N. E. A. COMMITTEE ON SOCIAL STUDIES.

The Committee on Social Studies of the N. E. A. Commission on Reorganization of Secondary Education held a meeting at Cleveland on February 24. The meeting was called to consider the desirability of supplementing or revising its original report, published as Bulletin 1916, No. 28, U. S. Bureau of Education.

At the time of its publication, the 1916 report was considered by many as a somewhat radical document, and was received in some quarters with a certain degree of scepticism. During the intervening four years, however, there has been a decided tendency to accept the essential principles of that report. The war has been very largely responsible for this, because of the shaking-up it has given to the social studies in high schools. When the necessity arose for a reorganization and reapplication of the social studies, including history, to meet the demand of the war period, consciously or unconsciously procedure has tended to follow the essential lines laid down in the report of 1916.

The demand for the bulletin containing the report has been so great that it has, at times, been difficult to supply it. The same is true with respect to Bulletin 1915, No. 23, containing a report of a sub-committee of the Committee on Social Studies on "The Teaching of Community Civics." These bulletins are being widely used as a basis for reorganization in many school systems, including a number of state school systems, among which are New Jersey, Iowa, and Pennsylvania.

Equally gratifying to the committee is the increasing agreement among the various committees working in the same field. This is notably true of the N. E. A. Committee, the Committee of the American Historical Association, and the Committee of the American Sociological Society, the last two issuing reports that harmonize in practically all essentials with the recommendations of the N. E. A. Report of 1916, at least so far as they relate to the secondary schools. This agreement is due in part to the influence of the war period, and in part to a persistent effort to "get together." A series of conferences has been held during the past winter between representatives of the committees named, and other committees working in the same field, and these committees now have an interlocking membership in order that each may be thoroughly informed of the viewpoints of the others.

At its Cleveland meeting, the N. E. A. Committee agreed that there is no occasion to modify the principles set forth

in its 1916 report, nor to make any radical changes in its recommendations relative to content and organization of the social studies. A resolution was adopted, however, to recommend a minimum requirement of a social study (including history, but excluding geography as a separate subject) in each of the six years of the secondary school work, five periods per week. This is in accord with the recommendations of the American Historical Association Committee and of the American Sociological Society Committee.

The chairman of the committee was also authorized to appoint a sub-committee to undertake such revision of details of the 1916 report as suggested by the trend of events since it was published, and to submit a revision or a supplement to the original report. It was the sense of the committee that there should be a clearer definition of the subject-matter of the several social studies recommended.

The membership of the Committee on Social Studies and of the sub-committee on revision is given below. Dr. Thomas Jesse Jones, the efficient chairman of the committee since its organization, is leaving for a year in Africa, and Dr. J. Lynn Barnard will act as chairman during his absence. The sub-committee on revision, Dr. J. M. Gambrill, Teachers' College, New York, chairman; Dr. J. Lynn Barnard, Arthur W. Dunn, D. C. Knowlton, Dr. Ross L. Finney, Dr. Henry Neumann, Henry R. Burch, Clarence D. Kingsley, Harriet Tuell, Ida A. Tourtellot.

Membership of the Committee on Social Studies of the N. E. A. Commission on Reorganization of Secondary Education:

Thomas Jesse Jones, chairman; J. Lynn Barnard, acting chairman, Lansdowne, Pa.; Arthur William Dunn, secretary, U. S. Bureau of Education, Washington.

W. A. Avery, Hampton Institute, Hampton, Va.

George G. Bechtel, Principal Northwestern High School, Detroit, Mich.

E. C. Branson, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, N. C.

Henry R. Burch, West Philadelphia High School, Philadelphia, Pa.

F. W. Carrier, Somerville High School, Somerville, Mass.

Dr. Edgar Dawson, Hunter College, New York City.

Jessie C. Evans, William Penn High School for Girls, Philadelphia, Pa.

Dr. Ross L. Finney, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minn.

J. M. Gambrill, Teachers' College, New York City.

Thomas W. Gosling, Department Public Instruction, Madison, Wis.

W. J. Hamilton, Superintendent of Schools, Oak Park, Ill.

Blanche C. Hazard, Cornell University, Ithaca, N. Y.

S. B. Howe, High School, Newark, N. J.

Clarence D. Kingsley, State High School Inspector, Boston, Mass.

Dr. D. C. Knowlton, Lincoln School, Teachers' College, New York City.

W. D. Lewis, Deputy Superintendent Public Instruction, Harrisburg, Pa.

A. E. McKinley, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. B. Meredith, Assistant Commissioner of Education, Trenton, N. J.

Henry Neumann, Ethical Culture School, New York.

James Harvey Robinson, Columbia University, New York City.

Harold O. Rugg, Teachers College, New York City.

Ida A. Tourtellot, McLachlen Building, Washington, D. C.

Harriet Tuell, Somerville High School, Somerville, Mass.

BOOK REVIEWS

EDITED BY PROFESSOR WAYLAND J. CHASE,
UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN.

RHODES, JAMES FORD. *History of the United States from Hayes to McKinley, 1877-1896.* New York: The Macmillan Co., 1919. Pp. 484. \$2.75.

When Doctor Rhodes in 1906 wrote the preface to the sixth and seventh volumes of his notable "History of the United States from the Compromise of 1850" he intimated that at some time he would carry the narrative beyond 1877. "A lack of basic knowledge," he explained, "for attacking the social questions involved" in the post-reconstruction era made it necessary for him to devote himself for some years to a careful study of that period. After thirteen years he has sent forth a single volume in fulfillment of his promise. Students of this field of American history have looked forward eagerly to the publication of the work.

Many of the same qualities which distinguished the earlier and more comprehensive work are evident in this; the same clarity, ease and elevation of style, the same blend of generosity and rugged honesty in dealing with political controversies and political leaders. But in general this volume falls far short of the standard set in the earlier ones. Twenty years is a long period to cover in one comprehensive volume; and the narrative has necessarily become attenuated. There are some evidences that Doctor Rhodes became bored by his task; for although the narrative opens with a degree of amplitude, it thins out more and more toward the end. To the first half of the period he devotes just twice as many pages as to the latter half; to the first five years 160 pages, to the last five, 64; and this notwithstanding, as it seems to the reviewer, the greater intrinsic interest and significance of the later years. The fact that Doctor Rhodes confined himself to political history, at a time when political life was uncommonly dreary, with an occasional excursion into a diplomatic question or a labor riot, may explain and justify weariness of the subject, but why should he have restricted himself in this way?

The reader who begins the volume with the hope of receiving enlightenment on "the great social questions" of what we now see more and more clearly was a profoundly significant period, is destined to a disappointment that grows heavier as he progresses. There is the barest mention of the agrarian unrest in the West and South, which culminated in the Farmers' Alliance, Populism and "free silver," and absolutely no evidence of any understanding of its causes, nor of any real sympathy with the desperate followers of those crusades. Nor is there any just estimate given of the reaction of these movements upon national politics, though a fair amount of material is available for such studies. The expansion of the railroad net, railway wars and combinations, rate discriminations, and the fight for regulation receive brief and perfunctory treatment, while even less attention is given to the early stages of the growth of the industrial trusts. Though Mr. Rhodes was himself "in the iron and coal business" in those days and gives excellent summaries of general business conditions, one might infer that he had never heard of the "trusts." Only one angle of the social questions touched him—the labor contests. In view of the calm way in which he discusses other subjects which in their day were exciting enough, such as the tariff, it is somewhat surprising to note with what evident hostility he deals with strikes, especially where they were accompanied by riots. In his account of the Chicago riots of 1886, which culminated in the Haymar-

ket outrage all restraint vanishes, and he dwells with fervid approval upon the conduct of the police and the attitude of the judge who presided over the trial, from whose later account of the affair he draws most of his material. He seems to have made little or no use of evidence on the other side, nor of the more scholarly accounts of these labor controversies, such for instance as Selig Perlman's chapters in Commons's "History of Labour in the United States."

Though he concentrates chiefly on political events, Doctor Rhodes has nothing to say concerning the political significance of the years 1888-1890. He gives no explanation of the schism among the Democrats, 1893-1896; and although the volume professes to carry the story down to McKinley, not a word is said about the tumultuous and extremely significant campaign of 1896! Yet he inserts a long chapter on the activities of the Molly Maguires during Hayes's term.

While not without obvious merits, the book on the whole is disappointing. It is not up to the standard of the earlier volumes, and can add nothing to the reputation of its distinguished author.

CHARLES W. RAMSDELL.

The University of Texas.

INMAN, SAMUEL GUY. *Intervention in Mexico.* New York: Association Press, 1919. Pp. xi, 248. \$1.50.

Doctor Inman's book, "Intervention in Mexico," might well act as a "Stop! Look! Listen!" warning to the not inconsiderable portion of the American public which has come to accept without question the view that the intervention of the United States by force of arms in Mexico is bound to come sooner or later, and which regards the accounts fed daily to it of every lawless act in Mexico as evidence that conditions are becoming increasingly intolerable there. He throws light on aspects of the problem which are neglected in the interventionist propaganda, and gives the reader first-hand information on conditions in Mexico at the present time, information which contradicts the widely-prevalent impression of universal anarchy and disorder.

The author has been connected with American mission schools in Mexico for several years, has traveled extensively in Mexico and all Latin America, and wrote the book under review after a trip through Mexico in the spring of 1919. The book cannot therefore be dismissed as out of date.

The book is begun with a chapter entitled, "Various Aspects of the Problem," in which there is pointed out the need for understanding the Mexican viewpoint, reasons for American misunderstanding of the problem, and certain ill effects which interventionist propaganda is having in Latin America, Mexico, and our own country. Intervention is also considered in the light of America's democratic ideals and Mexico's sovereign rights.

Continuing, a picture is given of Mexicans and their condition before and after the Revolution, to show that many old abuses have been removed since Diaz was overthrown, and that there has been a real social revolution from which there can be no turning back to another Diaz regime; and the author tells of the young men of the nation, great numbers of whom were educated in American mission schools and even in the United States, who are filling many of the official positions in Mexico, and throwing themselves enthusiastically and devotedly into the work of the reconstruction of their country. The difficulties of a period of reconstruction in any country are pleaded and apt comparisons made with lawless conditions in our own country after the Civil War. A chapter is devoted to a personal

estimate of President Carranza, an estimate which appears frank and judicious. Considerable space is given to a discussion of Carranza's attitude toward foreign commercial interests.

In a chapter called "What Mexicans Think of Americans," a history of the relations between the two nations and their peoples is given and characterized "a series of misunderstandings." Many facts were dwelt upon to show that Mexicans had their grievances against Americans as well as Americans against Mexicans, but the author takes care to emphasize a point that according to "the best judgment of reliable Americans and his own experience that" "neither Carranza nor his responsible officers have ever attacked or persecuted Americans because they were Americans." He points out, too, that despite the insistence of German propaganda all Mexican newspapers which expressed independent judgments during the war were pro-Ally. To him the outstanding thing to be observed in Mexico at this time is a desire for friendship with the United States, and he quotes at length from Mexican sources to bear out his point.

Conclusive as its case against intervention may be, the completion of its presentation does not conclude the book. Having excluded intervention as a solution of the Mexican problem, the author presents a solution along different lines. It lies, believes Doctor Inman, in education, not mere learning, but education which looks to the upbuilding of character, of a spirit of unity, and of a spirit of service in the Mexican people. A successful community organization known as the People's Institute in the town of Piedras Negras is described in detail to show how these aims of education have been met in a practical way. The benefits of a national school of higher learning financed by friends of Mexico in the United States, and of exchanges of students between the two countries are touched upon. And lastly there is presented a vast, practical, comprehensive educational program for all Mexico, a program which was recently worked out by a group of American mission school men, and which has the support of President Carranza.

Doctor Inman views the Mexican problem as "not a revolution to be crushed, but an evolution to be guided." The viewpoint merits careful consideration.

S. B. BUTLER.

Middletown High School, Middletown, Conn.

CURRENT PERIODICAL ARTICLES ON THE TEACHING OF HISTORY.

LISTED BY W. L. HALL, NEW YORK STATE LIBRARY.

- Dodd, W. E. Nationalism in American History. *The Texas History Teachers' Bulletin*, VIII (University of Texas Bulletin, No. 2010, February 15, 1920), 55-66.
 Gathany, J. Madison. The Week's Outlook: A Weekly Outline Study of Current History. *The Outlook*.
 Stockton, J. L. Teaching Current Events. *The Texas History Teachers' Bulletin*, VIII (University of Texas Bulletin, No. 2010, February 15, 1920), 76-81.
 Yeomans, Edward. A Teacher of History. *Atlantic Monthly*, CXXV (March, 1920), 369-377.

HISTORICAL ARTICLES IN CURRENT PERIODICALS.

LISTED BY LEO F. STOCK.

GENERAL AND MISCELLANEOUS.

- The Present Condition of Economic History. N. S. B. Gras (*Quarterly Journal of Economics*, February).
 The Roman Church and Modern Italian Democracy. Giorgio La Piana (*Harvard Theological Review*, April).

Russia and the Dual Alliance. Laurence B. Packard (*American Historical Review*, April).

The Five Stripes of China's Flag. Charles H. Sherrill (*North American Review*, April).

Japan in Korea. Homer B. Hulbert (*Journal of International Relations*, January).

Peasant Co-operation and Agrarian Reform in Rumania. M. M. Knight (*Political Science Quarterly*, March).

The Religious Revolution in Russia. Dr. Peter J. Popoff (*Current History*, April).

Inner History of the German Revolution. F. Sefton Delmer (*Nineteenth Century and After*, March).

THE BRITISH EMPIRE.

A Brief History of Medieval Roman Canon Law in England. Charles P. Sherman (*University of Pennsylvania Law Review*, March).

Indian Title in British Columbia. J. A. J. McKenna (*Canadian Magazine*, April).

Memories of the House of Lords. Alfred Harrison (*Nineteenth Century and After*, March).

Life and Letters of Sir Wilfrid Laurier (continued). Oscar D. Skelton (*Century*, April).

Fifty Years of Canadian Progress, 1867-1917 (with discussion). E. H. Godfrey (*Journal of Royal Statistical Society*, January).

The British Cabinet, 1916-1919. Robert L. Schuyler (*Political Science Quarterly*, March).

GREAT WAR AND ITS PROBLEMS.

Germany's Hatred of England. (*Current History*, April). Historical light on the legend of "Perfidious Albion" and its part in causing the war.

Popular Highlights of the Great War. Franklin B. Morse (*Current History*, April).

Anti-American Propaganda in Hispanic America. Edward Perry (*Hispanic American Historical Review*, February).

War Guilt of Count Berchtold. (*Current History*, April).

Constantinople Under the Germans. (*Current History*, April). Life in the Turkish capital in 1917 and 1918, described by an American eye-witness.

Fate of German Spies in England. (*Current History*, April).

Achievements of French Surgeons. Dr. Francois Helme (*Current History*, April).

Losses of France in the War. Gabriel Louis-Jaray (*Current History*, April).

The Victory at Sea (continued). Rear Admiral William S. Sims (*World's Work*, April). VIII. The London flagship.

At "the House of the Flirt." Patrick Gallagher (*Century*, April). "An interesting and entertaining account of the history, past and contemporary, social and political, connected with President Wilson's official residence during the peace conference in Paris."

Ohio's German-Language Press and the Peace Negotiations. Carl Wittke (*Ohio Archaeological and Historical Quarterly*, January).

Canada and the Imperial War Cabinet. George M. Wrong (*Canadian Historical Review*, March).

Constantinople: The Greatest Problem. Herbert A. Gibbons (*Century*, April).

The Caucasus and the World War. J. F. Scheltema (*Current History*, April).

The Shantung Issue. Payson J. Treat (*Journal of International Relations*, January).

The Shantung Question. Charles B. Elliott (*American Journal of International Law*, October).

THE UNITED STATES AND DEPENDENCIES.

Further Discoveries Concerning the Kensington Rune Stone. H. R. Holland (*Wisconsin Magazine of History*, March).

The Story of Wisconsin, 1634-1648. Louise P. Kellogg (*Wisconsin Magazine of History*, March). V. Foreign immigration in territorial times.

- The Early History of Jonathan Carver. William Brown-
ing (*Wisconsin Magazine of History*, March).
- The Life of Thomas Johnson, IV. Edward S. Delaplaine
(*Maryland Historical Magazine*, March).
- The Voyage of the *Hope*, 1790-1792. F. W. Howay (*Wash-
ington Historical Quarterly*, January).
- An Experiment of the Fathers in State Socialism. M. M.
Quaife (*Wisconsin Magazine of History*, March).
- Francis Heron, Fur Trader: Other Herons. William S.
Lewis (*Washington Historical Quarterly*, January).
- Historic Spots in Wisconsin. W. A. Titus (*Wisconsin
Magazine of History*, March). II. Fond du Lac trad-
ing post and early settlement.
- The First Official Thanksgiving in Illinois. Isabel Jamison
(*Journal of Illinois State Historical Society*, October,
1918).
- Hispanic-American Appreciations of the Monroe Doctrine.
William S. Robertson (*Hispanic American Historical
Review*, February).
- The Drama in California, '49 and '50. John H. McCabe
(*Grizzly Bear*, March).
- Recollections of Early Times on the Ohio and Pennsylvania
Railroad. Thomas L. Rodgers (*Western Pennsylvania
Historical Magazine*, January).
- The Development of the Free Public High School in Illinois
in 1860. Paul E. Belting (*Journal of Illinois State
Historical Society*, October, 1918).
- The International Grain Trade of the United States, 1850-
1860. Louis B. Schmidt (*Iowa Journal of History and
Politics*, January).
- Historical Survey of the Militia in Iowa, 1865-1898. Cyril
B. Upham (*Iowa Journal of History and Politics*,
January).
- The Purchase of Alaska. Frank A. Golder (*American His-
torical Review*, April).
- The Miners' Laws of Colorado. Thomas M. Marshall
(*American Historical Review*, April).
- Roosevelt and Our Coin Designs. Homer Saint-Gaudens
(*Century*, April).
- Theodore Roosevelt and His Time, VIII. Joseph B. Bishop
(*Scribner's*, April). Correspondence with King Ed-
ward, Kaiser Wilhelm II, the Czar Nicholas, Emperor
of Japan, King Albert, and Queen Elizabeth of Rou-
mania.

BOOKS ON HISTORY AND GOVERNMENT PUBLISHED
IN THE UNITED STATES FROM FEBRUARY
28 TO MARCH 27, 1920.

LISTED BY CHARLES A. COULOMB, PH.D.

AMERICAN HISTORY.

- Bradley, Glenn D. The Story of the Santa Fé. Boston:
Badger. 288 pp. (bbl.). \$3.00, net.
- Bunau-Varilla, Philippe. The great adventure of Panama.
Garden City, N. Y.: Doubleday, Page. 267 pp. \$1.75,
net.
- Bushnell, David I., Jr. Native villages and village sites
east of the Mississippi. Wash., D. C.: Gov. Pr. Off.
111 pp. (3 pp. bibls.). 55 cents.
- Griffin, Grace Gardner, compiler. Writings on American
History, 1917. New Haven: Yale Univ. Press. 200
pp. \$3.00.
- McKinley, Albert E. Illustrated topics for American history.
Revised and enlarged edition. Phila.: McKin-
ley Pub. Co., 1621 Ranstead St. 216 pp. (loose leaf).
\$1.30, net.
- Saville, Marshall H. Archæological specimens from New
England. N. Y.: Mus. of Am. Indians. 10 pp. 15
cents.
- Skinner, Alanson B. An ancient Algonkian fishing village
of Cayuga, New York. N. Y.: Mus. of the Am. Indian.
43-57 pp. 40 cents.
- The pre-Iroquoian Algonkian Indians of central and west-
ern New York. N. Y.: Mus. of the Am. Indian. 37 pp.
40 cents.

ANCIENT HISTORY.

- Diocletian, Caius Valerius. Edict of Diocletian establish-
ing a maximum schedule of prices for commodities and
services throughout the Roman Empire, 310 A. D.
Providence, R. I.: Union Trust Co. 24 pp.

ENGLISH HISTORY.

- Filippi, Lt. Col. Filippo de. The relations of the house of
Savoy with the court of England. N. Y.: Oxford Univ.
22 pp. 90 cents.
- Haldane, Richard B. H., Viscount. Before the war. N. Y.:
Funk & Wagnalls. 233 pp. \$2.50, net.
- Lynd, Robert. Ireland a nation. N. Y.: Dodd, Mead. 299
pp. \$2.00, net.
- MacNeill, Eoin. Phases of Irish history. St. Louis:
Herder. 364 pp. \$4.50, net.
- Thornley, Isabel D. England under the Yorkists, 1460-
1485. (Univ. of London intermediate source books of
history, No. 2.) N. Y.: Longmans. 280 pp. \$3.25,
net.
- Tout, Thomas F. An advanced history of Great Britain,
from the earliest times to 1918. (New edition.)
N. Y.: Longmans. 793 pp. (bibls.). \$2.50, special
net.
- Tout, Thomas F. Chapters in the administrative history
of Medieval England; the wardrobe, the chamber, and
the small seals. 2 vols. N. Y.: Longmans. 317, 364
pp. Each \$7.00, net.

EUROPEAN HISTORY.

- Boswell, A. Bruce. Poland and the Poles. N. Y.: Dodd,
Mead. 313 pp. \$4.00, net.
- Cantacuzène, Princess. Russian people; revolutionary
recollections. N. Y.: Scribner. 321 pp. \$3.00, net.
- Gorica, Joseph, and Stowe, Lyman Beecher. The inside
story of Austro-German intrigue; or, How the world
war was brought about. Garden City, N. Y.: Double-
day, Page. 301 pp. \$3.00, net.
- Moses, Bernard. Spain's declining power in South America,
1730-1806. Berkeley, Calif.: Univ. of Calif. 440 pp.
\$4.00.
- Treitschke, Heinrich G. von. History of Germany in the
nineteenth century. Vol. 7. [Final volume, 1840-
1848.] N. Y.: McBride. 631 pp. \$3.50, net.

THE WORLD WAR AND RECONSTRUCTION.

- Adam, H. Pearl. Paris sees it through; a diary, 1914-
1918. N. Y.: Doran. 331 pp. \$4.00, net.
- Albertson, Ralph. Fighting without a war; an account of
military intervention in north Russia. N. Y.: Har-
court, Brace and Howe. 138 pp. \$1.50, net.
- American Association for International Conciliation.
Agreements between the United States and France and
between England and France, June 28, 1919. Anglo-
Persian agreement, August 9, 1919. N. Y.: Am. Assn.
for Internat. Concil. 27 pp.
- Artmann, Ferdinand. Labour; a brief review of ways and
means for the national economic reconstruction of Cen-
tral and Eastern Europe [etc.]. N. Y.: Lemcke and
Buechner. 25 pp. 75 cents.
- Bacon, Admiral Sir Reginald. The Dover Patrol, 1915-
1917. In 2 vols. N. Y.: Doran. 370, 346 pp. \$10.00,
net.
- Barron, Clarence W. A world remaking; or, Peace finance.
N. Y.: Harper. 242 pp. \$1.75, net.
- Doyle, Sir Arthur C. A history of the great war. Vol. 5.
The British campaign in France and Flanders, 1918,
January to July. N. Y.: Doran. 355 pp. \$3.00, net.
- Edmunds, Sterling D. International law and the Treaty
of Peace. Wash., D. C.: Gov. Pr. Off. 55 pp.
- Laws of France, 1919; town planning and reparation of
damages caused by the events of the war. N. Y.: Na-
tional Civic Federation, 1 Madison Ave. 51 pp. \$1.00.

- Lucas, Sir Charles P. The gold coast and the war. N. Y.: Oxford Univ. 56 pp. 90 cents.
- Lyman, George H. The story of the Massachusetts committee on public safety, Feb. 10, 1917-Nov. 21, 1918. Boston: G. H. Lyman, 351 Commonwealth Ave. 600 pp. (privately printed).
- McClellan, Edwin N. The United States Marine Corps in the world war. Wash., D. C.: Gov. Pr. Off. 103 pp. Supt. of Docs. 10 cents.
- Page, Arthur W. Our 110 days' fighting. Garden City, N. Y.: Doubleday-Page. 283 pp. \$5.00, net.
- St. Clair, Labert. The story of the liberty loans. Wash., D. C.: James W. Bryan Press, 324 Munsey Bldg. 186 pp. \$5.00, net.
- Torrance, Stiles A. Geographical results of the great war. N. Y.: American Bk. Co. 20 pp. 20 cents.
- U. S. General Staff, War Plans Division Historical Branch. A handbook of economic agencies of the war of 1917 (monograph 3). Wash., D. C.: Gov. Pr. Off. 539 pp.
- Williams-Ellis, Maj. C., and Williams-Ellis, A. The tank corps. N. Y.: Doran. 421 pp. \$5.00, net.
- Wise, Lt.-Col. Jennings C. The turn of the tide; American operations at Cantigny, Chateau Thierry, and the second battle of the Marne. N. Y.: Holt. 255 pp. \$1.50, net.

MEDIEVAL HISTORY.

- Al-Baghdadi, Abu-Mansur 'abd-al-Kahir ibn Tahir. Moslem schism and sects, being the history of the various philosophic systems developed in Islam. Part I. N. Y.: Lemeke and Buechner. 224 pp. \$2.00.
- Wedel, Theodore Otto. The medieval attitude toward astrology, particularly in England. New Haven: Yale Univ. Press. 189 pp. \$2.50, net.

MISCELLANEOUS.

- Aslan, Kevork. America and the Armenians, from the earliest times to the great war (1914). N. Y.: Macmillan. 138 pp. \$1.25, net.
- Elguero, José. Ximénez de Cisneros; ensayo de critica histórica. San Antonio, Texas: Lozano, 118 N. Santa Rosa Ave. 89 pp. \$1.00, net.
- Gibbons, Herbert A. France and Ourselves; interpretative studies, 1917-1919. N. Y.: Century Co. 286 pp. \$1.50, net.
- United States, Bureau of Education, Library. List of references on the project method in education. (Library Leaflet 9.) Wash., D. C.: Gov. Pr. Off.

BIOGRAPHY.

- Clark, Champ. My quarter-century of American politics. 2 vols. N. Y.: Harper. 945, 472 pp. \$6.00, net.
- Pepper, Charles M. The life and times of Henry Gassaway Davis, 1823-1916. N. Y.: Century Co. 318 pp. \$4.00, net.
- Gardner, Maj. Augustus P. Some letters of Augustus Peabody Gardner. Boston: Houghton Mifflin. 126 pp. \$2.00, net.
- Hobbs, William H. Leonard Wood, administrator, soldier, and citizen. N. Y.: Putnam. 272 pp. \$2.00, net.

GOVERNMENT AND POLITICS.

- Bigelow, Melville M. Papers on the legal history of government. Boston: Little, Brown. 256 pp. \$2.00, net.
- Butler, Nicholas M. Is America worth saving; addresses on national problems and party policies. N. Y.: Scribner. 398 pp. \$2.00, net.
- Kimball, Everett. The national government of the United States. Boston: Ginn & Co. 629 pp. \$3.60.
- Lippman, Walter. Liberty and the news. N. Y.: Harcourt, Brace and Howe. 104 pp. \$1.00, net.
- Wells, Hulet M. Wilson and the issues of to-day. Seattle, Wash.: Rayner's Old Bk. Store, 1330 First Ave. 125 pp. 50 cents.

UNIVERSITY OF COLORADO

BOULDER, COLORADO

Summer Quarter, 1920

First Term - June 14-July 21

Second Term, July 22-August 28

In the foothills of the Rockies. Ideal conditions for summer study and recreation. Courses in Liberal Arts, Law, Medicine, Ophthalmology, Engineering, and Vocational subjects. Able faculty, Eminent lecturers. Attractive courses for teachers. Address Registrar for catalogue.

STATEMENT OF THE OWNERSHIP, MANAGEMENT, CIRCULATION, ETC., REQUIRED BY THE ACT OF CONGRESS OF AUGUST 24, 1912,

of THE HISTORICAL OUTLOOK, published monthly, except July, August and September, at Philadelphia, Pa., for April 1, 1920.

County of Philadelphia. }
State of Pennsylvania, } ss.

Before me, a notary public in and for the State and County aforesaid, personally appeared Alfred C. Willits, who, having been duly sworn according to law, deposes and says that he is the business manager of THE HISTORICAL OUTLOOK, and that the following is, to the best of his knowledge and belief, a true statement of the ownership, management (and if a daily paper, the circulation), etc., of the aforesaid publication for the date shown in the above caption, required by the Act of August 24, 1912, embodied in section 443, Postal Laws and Regulations, printed on the reverse of this form, to wit:

1. That the names and addresses of the publisher, editor, managing editor, and business managers are:

Publisher, MCKINLEY PUBLISHING Co., Philadelphia, Pa.
Editor, ALBERT E. MCKINLEY, Philadelphia, Pa.
Managing Editor, ALBERT E. MCKINLEY, Philadelphia, Pa.
Business Manager, ALFRED C. WILLITS, Philadelphia, Pa.

2. That the owners are (give names and addresses of individual owners, or, if a corporation, give its name and the names and addresses of stockholders owning or holding one per cent. or more of the total amount of stock).

ALBERT E. MCKINLEY, Philadelphia, Pa.
CHARLES S. MCKINLEY, Youngstown, O.

3. That the known bondholders, mortgagees, and other security holders owning or holding one per cent. or more of total amount of bonds, mortgages, or other securities are (if there are none, so state).

None.

4. That the two paragraphs next above, giving the names of the owners, stockholders, and security holders, if any, contain not only the list of stockholders and security holders as they appear upon the books of the company, but also, in cases where the stockholder or security holder appears upon the books of the company as trustee or in any other fiduciary relation, the name of the person or corporation for whom such trustee is acting, is given; also that the said two paragraphs contain statements embracing affiant's full knowledge and belief as to the circumstances and conditions under which stockholders and security holders who do not appear upon the books of the company as trustees, hold stock and securities in a capacity other than that of a bona fide owner; and this affiant has no reason to believe that any other person, association, or corporation has any interest direct or indirect in the said stock, bonds, or other securities than as so stated by him.

5. That the average number of copies of each issue of this publication sold or distributed, through the mails or otherwise, to paid subscribers during the six months preceding the date shown above is.....

(This information is required from daily publications only.)

ALFRED C. WILLITS.

Sworn to and subscribed before me this 25th day of March, 1920.

JULIA M. O'BRIEN.

100,000!

OVER ONE HUNDRED THOUSAND OF THE

Breasted Ancient History Series

(16 Wall Maps)

Harding European History Series

(27 Wall Maps)

Hart-Bolton American History Series

(24 Wall Maps)

Are used in the Schools of America. And the demand grows! WHY?

Because they were designed by educators, edited by scholars, and produced by craftsmen.

Is your school without them and the very helpful teacher's manuals written to accompany them?

See previous issues of the HISTORICAL OUTLOOK for our announcements on these maps.

For additional particulars fill in, cut out and mail the coupon.

DENOYER-GEPPERT COMPANY

SCIENTIFIC SCHOOL MAP MAKERS

460 East Ohio Street, Chicago

Please send me catalog describing your History Maps in detail. Also send me information on the following items, checked:

- | | |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> New Geography Maps | <input type="checkbox"/> Phillips' Comparative Wall Atlas Maps |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Finch Commercial Geography Maps | <input type="checkbox"/> Politico-Relief Maps |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Historical Pictures | <input type="checkbox"/> Harison Desk Outline Maps |

Name _____ School _____

Address _____